

The Review of English Studies

VOL. IV.—NO. 14.

APRIL 1928.

SIR WALTER RALEGH'S *CYNTHIA*

BY AGNES M. C. LATHAM

IN *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, Spenser describes how Sir Walter Raleigh visited him at Kilcolman in the autumn of 1589, heard him read some of *The Faerie Queene*, and persuaded him to come back to England and publish it there. To Spenser Raleigh read a poem of his own, which was never published, and was long known only from Spenser's account, as the "lost poem" of *Cynthia*. But in the middle of the last century, when Mr. C. J. Stewart was cataloguing the Cecil Papers at Hatfield House, he came upon a manuscript in Raleigh's hand, which contained part of the lost poem. A transcript made by the librarian at Hatfield was published by Archdeacon Hannah in 1870 in his collection of Raleigh's poems (*The Poems of Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Henry Wotton, etc.*, Aldine Edition). Hannah, through some misconception, imagined the manuscript to have been written after the death of the Queen in 1603, and printed it as a "Continuation of the lost poem of Cynthia," being the twenty-first and twenty-second books. Sir Edmund Gosse, in *The Athenæum* for January 1886 (pp. 32 and 66), contradicted Hannah's date and showed that the Hatfield fragment must be considered as part of the original poem of *Cynthia*, written he believes in 1589. Another and still more probable date, suggested by Mr. Stebbing in his *Life of Raleigh*, is 1592.

But although Hannah's error concerning the date has been pointed out, the books are still believed to be the twenty-first and twenty-second. An examination of the manuscript, permitted me by the courtesy of the Marquess of Salisbury, has convinced me

that this also is an error. Raleigh never wrote a poem of such unwieldy length, but finished in accordance with classical precedent, with the eleventh and twelfth books, which are those preserved at Hatfield. The heading of the first is "The 11:th and last booke of the Ocean to Scinthia." The figure eleven is written with a backward flourish on the initial 1 which makes it look exactly like a 2, but the letters *th* are unmistakable. The next book is headed "The end of the bookes, of the Oceans love to Scinthia, and the beginninge of the 12 boock, entreatinge of Sorrow." Here the flourished 1 cannot be distinguished from the 2 which follows, and there is no *th*, but the figure must of course be 12.

The twelfth book, beginning on fol. 247 *recto*, is a fragment of seven verses, breaking off abruptly in the middle of a line at the top of fol. 247 *verso*. It is in a curious three-line metre, the first and third lines rhyming. One other poem written in this metre is ascribed to Raleigh. It is a set of twelve verses, preserved among the Hawthornden MSS., with the title "S. W. Raghlies Petition to the Queene. 1618." There is a transcript made by Mr. Laing in *Archæologia Scotica*, vol. iv, pp. 237-8. Hannah also printed the poem, claiming it for Raleigh, in 1870. The Queen to whom it was addressed is Queen Anne of Denmark, who is known to have befriended Raleigh, and the year, 1618, is that of his death.

Sir Edmund Gosse, in his article on *Cynthia* in *The Athenæum*, denied that the last fragment had any connection with that poem. There are four fragments in all, and Sir Edmund, who had not himself seen the MS. and who doubted very much the claim that it was autograph, believed that only the long eleventh—or as he calls it twenty-first—book was part of *Cynthia*. The last book, he says, is "a melancholy and obscure fragment of reverie, belonging to Raleigh's latest period, and probably written in the very month before his death," and suggests that it may be a rejected section of the *Petition to Queen Anne*. The hand of the manuscript however, a kind of fine Italian script, bears a very close resemblance to such autograph letters of Raleigh's as are preserved in the British Museum, and to my inexperienced eye there seems little doubt that it is his hand. In that case his own statement that the last fragment is the beginning of the last book of *Cynthia* must be accepted.

But for all that, it is connected in a curious way, which I have recently discovered, with the *Petition to Queen Anne*. In the British Museum Additional MS. 27407, a miscellaneous collection of papers,

belonging mainly to the seventeenth century, is a copy of a poem, anonymous* and without title, which begins with the first two stanzas of the last book of *Cynthia* and ends with the *Petition to Queen Anne*. The sheet upon which it is written, in an Italian hand, bears no indication of its origin. It is fol. 130 of the MS. There are seventeen verses, two of them from the twelfth book of *Cynthia*, six from the *Petition to Queen Anne*, and the rest not elsewhere to be found, though one of them uses in a new sense the curious, grim image of the seventh verse of *Cynthia*,

like the moss
havinge cumpassion of unburied bones.

The Museum version I take to be an intermediate stage between the twelfth book of *Cynthia* and the *Petition to Queen Anne*. The *Petition* when completed, omits all that came originally from the last fragment of *Cynthia*. It seems to me to omit all the more personal and emotional part. The finished poem has the dignity and restraint which is fitting in an appeal to a sovereign. The passionate lament that friends are faithless, which fills much of the intermediate version, could not have concerned Anne of Denmark. It is therefore very rightly rejected, and the poem takes on a colder and more impersonal character.

It is not the only example among Raleigh's poems of the recasting of earlier work. The first eight lines of *Even such is time*, so long believed to have been written the night before his execution, were discovered by Mr. Bullen to have been once the last verse of a love song, bewailing the passing of all beauty (see *Speculum Amantis*, and B.M. MS. Addit. 25707, MS. Harley 6917, MS. Sloane 1446).

MS. HATFIELD (Cecil Papers 144). Fol. 247 *recto* and *verso*.

The end of the bookes, of the Oceans love to Scinthia,
and the begininge of the 12 boock, entreatinge of
Sorrow.

My dayes delights, my springetyme ioies forduunn,
Which in the dawne, and risinge soonn of youth

3. had their creation, and weare first begunn,
do in the yeveninge, and the winter sadd
present my minde, which takes my tymes accompt
6. the greif remayninge of the ioy it had.
my tymes that then rann ore them seales in thes
and now runn out in others happines
9. bring vnto thos new ioies, and new borne dayes,

* [But the sheet is endorsed 'S^r Walter Raleigh' in a hand which is, at least, very similar to that of the poem.—ED. R.E.S.]

- so could shee not, if shee weare not the soonn,
which sees the birth, and buriall, of all elce,
12. and holds that poure, with which shee first begunn,
levinge each withered boddy to be torne
by fortune, and by tymes tempestius,
15. which by her vertu, once faire frute have borne,
knowinge shee cann renew, and cann create
green from the grounde, and floures, yeven out of stone,
18. by vertu lastinge over tyme and date.
levinge us only woe, which like the moss,
havinge cumpassion of unburied bones,
21. cleaves to mischance, and unrepayred loss
for tender stalkes,

MS. HAWTHORNDEN. (From D. Laing's transcript in *Archeologia Scotica*, vol. iv, pp. 237-238, corrected by Hannah.)

S. W. Raghlies Petition to the Queene. 1618.

- O had Truth power, the guiltlesse could not fall,
Malice winne glorie, or Reuenge triumphe,
3. But Truth alone can not encounter all.

- Mercie is fled to God, which Mercie made,
Compassion dead, Faith turn'd to pollicye ;
6. Freinds know not those who site in Sorrow's shade.

- For what wee somtyme were, wee are no more,
Fortune hath chang'd our shape, and Destinie
9. Defaced the vearye forme hee had before.

- All loue and all desert of former tymes
Malice hath couered from my Soueraignes cics ;
12. And largelie laid abroad supposed crimes.

- But kyngs call not to mynd what Vassalls were,
But know them now, as Enuie hath descriud them ;
15. So can I looke on no syde from Despaire.

- Cold walls, to you I speake, but you are senslesse ;
Celestiall Powers, you heare, but haue determined,
18. And shall determine to my greatest happinesse.

- Then unto whom shall I vnfold my wrong,
Cast downe my teares, or hold up folded hands ?
21. To Her to whom remorse doth most belong.

- To Her who is the first, and maye alone
Be justlie call'd the Emprise of the Bretannes !
24. Who should haue mercye, if a Queene haue none ?

- Saue those that would haue died for your defence !
Saue him whose thoughts no treason ever tainted !
27. For, loe ! Destruction is no recompense.

If I haue sold my duetye (sold my faith)
 To strangers (which was only due to one)
 30. No thing I should estime so deare as death.

But if both God and tyme shall make you know
 That I your humblest Vassail am opprest,
 33. Then cast your eyes on vnderdeserued woe.

That I and myne maye neuer murne the misse
 Of Her wee had (but praise our liuing Queene),
 36. Who brings vs equall, if not greater blisse.

Lines 13-15 and 25-36 are only in the Hawthornden MS.

BM. ADDITIONAL MS. 27407, fol. 130. Collated with MS. Hatfield and MS. Hawthornden.

My dayes delight, my spring tyme ioyes foredun
 Which in the dawne and rysing Sunne of youth
 3. Had their creation and were first begun

Doe in the Evening, and the Winter sad
 Present my Mynde (which takes my tymes account)
 6. The grieffe remayning of the ioye it had

For as noe fortune stands, soe noe Mans Loue
 Stayes by the wretched and disconsolate
 9. All old affections from new sorrowes Moue

Mosse to vnburied bones, Ivie to walles
 Whom Life and people haue abandoned
 12. Till th'one be rotten, stayes till th'other falles

But friendship, kindred, and Loues Memorie
 Dies sole, extinguish hearing or behoulding
 15. The voyce of woe, or face of Miserie

Who being in all like those winter showers
 Doe come uncald, but then forebear to fall
 18. When parching heate hath burnt both Leaues and flowers

And what we some tyme were we seeme noe More
 Fortune hath changd our Shapes, and Destinie
 21. Defac'd our very forme we had before

For did in cinders any heate remayne
 Of those cleare fyres of Loue and friendlines
 24. I could not call for right and call in vaine

Or had Truth power, the guiltles could not fall
 Malice, vaine-glorie, and revenge triumph
 27. But Truth alone Cannot encounter all

All Loue, and all desert of former tymes
 Malice hath covered from my Soveraignes Eyes
 30. And Largely laide abroade supposed Crymes

Burying the former with their Memorie
 Teaching offence to speake before it goe
 33. Disguising private hate with publique dutie

But Mercie is fled to God that Mercie Made
Compassion dead, fayth turn'd to policie
36. Which knowes not those which sit in sorrowes shade

Cold walles to you I speake, but you are senclesse
Celestiall poweres you heard but haue determined
39. And shall determyne to the greatest happinesse

To whom then shall I crie to whom shall wronge
Cast downe her teares, or hould vp fouled handes
42. To her to whom remorse doth most belonge

To her that is the first and may alone
Be called Impresse of the Brittaines
45. Who should haue Mercie if a Queen haue none

Who should resist stronge hate, fierce Iniurie
Or who releiue th'oppressed state of Truth,
48. Who is Companion els to powerfull Maiestie

But you great, godliest, powerfull Princesse
Who haue brought glorie and posteritie
51. Vnto this Widdowe Land and people hopelesse.

Lines 1-6 are as lines 1-6 in MS. Hatfield.

1 delight]delights MS. Hatfield.

Lines 7-18 are only in MS. Addit. 27407, but cf. lines 10-12 and lines 19-21 in MS. Hatfield.

Lines 19-21 are verse 3 in MS. Hawthornden.

19 And]For 19 seeme]are 20 Shapes]shape 21 our]the 21 we]hee

Lines 22-24 are only in Addit. MS. 27407. Lines 25-27 are the first verse in MS. Hawthornden.

25 Or]O 26 vaine-glorie]winne glorie 26 and]or

Lines 28-30 are verse 4 in MS. Hawthornden. After line 30 MS. Hawthornden has a verse which is not in Addit. MS. 27407. Lines 31-33 are not in MS. Hawthornden. Lines 34-36 are verse 2 in MS. Hawthornden.

34 But Mercie]Mercie 34 that]which 36 Which knowes not]Freinds know not 36 which]who

Lines 37-39 are verse 6 in MS. Hawthornden.

38 heard]heare 39 the]my

Lines 40-42 are verse 7 in MS. Hawthornden.

40 Then unto whom shall I vnfold my wrong 41 her]my

Lines 43-45 are verse 8 in MS. Hawthornden.

43 that]who 44 Be called Impresse]Be justlie call'd the Empresse

Lines 46-51 are not in MS. Hawthornden, which has in their place four verses not in Addit. MS. 27407.

NOTES ON THOMAS HEYWOOD'S LATER REPUTATION

BY LOUIS B. WRIGHT

THE popularity of Thomas Heywood's dramatic works during the author's lifetime is a commonplace of stage history. Somewhat less realised is the fact that his non-dramatic works also enjoyed considerable contemporary favour. One evidence of Heywood's popularity is found in the records of the numerous editions of many of his productions. For example, Mr. A. M. Clark in his bibliography* lists eight quartos of *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* between 1605 and 1639. *Edward IV* went through five quarto and one octavo printings between 1599 and 1626. Even the *Gunaikion* had two editions, 1624 and 1657; *England's Elizabeth*, three editions between 1631 and 1641; and *The Life of Merlin*, two editions before 1651. Numerous printings of other plays and non-dramatic works attest the reading extent of Heywood's publications before the end of the first half of the seventeenth century. After the upheaval of the Puritan Revolution, Heywood's popularity, like that of many another Elizabethan, passed into eclipse and steadily dwindled.

It is a mistake, however, to conclude that the most prolific of Elizabethan stage-writers was ever completely forgotten. Since Lamb, of course, there has been a tendency to "re-discover" Heywood. I wish here to collect some of the scattered evidence relating to the acquaintance of later periods with Heywood.

The closing of the theatres in 1642 naturally ended the stage life of many of Heywood's plays. When the theatres re-opened in 1660, a new fashion in drama had arisen and the sophisticated cavaliers disdained the naïve plays of honest Heywood. Yet he was not utterly

* "A Bibliography of Thomas Heywood," *Oxford Bibliographical Society*, vol. i, pt. 2 (1924). Although Mr. Clark assigns many items to Heywood on inconclusive or erroneous evidence, his is the most complete bibliography of the editions of Heywood which has yet appeared.

forgotten in the dark days that followed 1642. At least he was remembered as the staunch defender of the theatre. The contemptuous reference of the anonymous author of "On the Time Poets" in *Choice Drollery* (1656) to "Th' apologetick Atlas of the stage" is well known. William Cartwright saw fit to bring out a new edition of *The Apology for Actors* in 1658. When Joshua Poole was seeking material for his *English Parnassus or A Helpe to English Poesie* (1657), a work which Milton may have used, he remembered Heywood. In a suggested assortment of epithets to be applied to women,* Poole selected choice phrases from the *Gunaikeion*. For appropriate selections, Poole also levied on the *Hierarchie of the Blessed Angells* and *Pleasant Dialogues and Drammas*. An indebtedness of Cowley to Heywood was years ago discerned by William Hazlitt: "The most splendid passage in Heywood's comedies is the account of the Shipwreck by Drink in *The English Traveller*, which was the foundation of Cowley's Latin play, *Naufragium Jocularé*."†

Even in the Restoration, Heywood was not entirely without a stage hearing. Professor Allardyce Nicoll cites the Lord Chamberlain's records of a performance of *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* at the Theatre Royal on August 17, 1667, as "The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth."‡ Pepys saw the play, and in his diary of the same date damned it as drama:

. . . At noon home to dinner, and presently my wife and I and Sir W. Pen to the King's Playhouse, where the house extraordinary full; and there was the King and Duke of York to see the new play, "Queen Elizabeth's Troubles, and the History of Eighty Eight." I confess I have sucked in so much of the sad story of Queen Elizabeth, from my cradle, that I was ready to weep for her sometimes; but the play is the most ridiculous that sure ever came upon the stage; and, indeed, is merely a shew, only shews the true garbe of the Queen in those days, just as we see Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth painted; but the play is merely a puppet play, acted by living puppets. Neither the design nor language better; and one stands by and tells us the meaning of things; only I was pleased to see Knipp dance among the milk maids, and to hear her sing a song to Queen Elizabeth; and to see her come out in her night-gowne with no lockes on, but her bare face and hair only tied up in a knot behind; which is the comeliest dress that ever I saw her in to her advantage. Thence home. . . .

* P. 563.

† *Lectures on the Dramatic Literature of the Age of Elizabeth* (Philadelphia, 1854), 47. [Cf. Prof. Nethercot at pp. 13-14 above.—Ed. R.E.S.]

‡ *A History of Restoration Drama* (Cambridge, 1923), 306.

Earlier than this, in 1661, the Duke of York's players had revived, along with several other Elizabethan plays, *Love's Mistress*. Heywood found, however, no permanent favour on the Restoration stage. Dryden regarded him with contempt. In *Macflecknoe*, addressing Shadwell, he comments: *

Heywood and Shirley were but types of thee,
Thou last great prophet of tautology.

Shadwell himself, without acknowledgment, borrowed extensively from Heywood and Brome's *The Late Lancashire Witches* in his own play, *The Lancashire Witches or Tegue O Dively the Irish Priest*. Shadwell reproduces incidents and situations in the earlier play.†

If that charming old play, *The Fair Maid of the West*, proved too impossible for Restoration stage-taste,‡ it at least begot a prose romance. In 1662 appeared "*The English Lovers: Or a Girl Worth Gold*. Both Parts So often Acted with General Applause; now newly formed into a Romance, by I. D. Gent" (John Dancer).

One other seventeenth-century adaptation of Heywood was made, this time of a non-dramatic work. In 1688 was published by Nathaniel Crouch, *Female Excellency*, a loose adaptation of Heywood's *The Exemplary Lives and Memorable Acts of Nine the most Worthy Women of the World* (1640). §

The seventeenth-century writers of biographies of poets and

* *The Works of Dryden*, edited by Sir Walter Scott (Edinburgh, 1882-93), x. 441.

† In his address to the reader Shadwell disclaims his ability to equal Shakespeare in drawing his magic from imagination. He claims to base all his own magic on authority and loads each act conclusion with pedantic burlesque of sources, not mentioning his indebtedness to Heywood. J. O. Halliwell-Phillips published privately both plays together without comment in *The Poetry of Witchcraft. Illustrated by copies of the Plays on the Lancashire Witches by Heywood and Shadwell* (Brixton Hill, 1853).

John Downes in *Roscius Anglicanus* (reprinted in F. G. Waldron's *Literary Museum*, pp. 49 ff.) relates the success of Shadwell's reworking of the Lancashire witch theme: "*The Lancashire Witches*, acted in 1681, made by Mr. Shadwell, being a kind of Opera, having several Machines of Flyings for the Witches, and other diverting Contrivances in't: all being well perform'd, it prov'd beyond expectation very beneficial to the Poet and Actors."

‡ Apparently one provincial production of the play occurred during the Restoration period. Ross Jewell, "*Heywood's Fair Maid of the West*," *Studies in English Drama* (University of Pennsylvania, 1917), pp. 71 ff., cites a record of the performance of this play at the King's Arms in Norwich in 1662.

§ Katherine Lee Bates, introduction to her edition of *A Woman Killed with Kindness* and *The Fair Maid of the West*, Belles-Lettres Series (New York, n.d.), pp. lxxiii-lxxiv. Miss Bates suggests that Crouch's *The History of the Nine Worthies of the World* (1687) may be an adaptation of Heywood's promised *Nine Worthy Men*, left unpublished but probably written at his death.

dramatists knew little of Heywood and did not take the trouble to learn more. Francis Kirkman in the advertisement to the second edition of his catalogue recounted Heywood's industry, "for he not only acted almost every day, but also obliged himself to write a sheet every day for several years together." He also added, "many of his plays being composed loosely in taverns, occasions them to be so mean." Edward Phillips in *Theatrum Poetarum** makes rather sarcastic reference to Heywood.

Langbaine was the first to make an effort at a fair evaluation of Heywood's works. He refuted Winstanley's tavern bill story of Heywood's method of composition, and added : †

To do our Author justice, I cannot allow that his Plays are so mean as Mr. Kirkman has represented them : for he was a general Scholar, and an indifferent Linguist, as his several Translations from Lucian, Erasmus, Textor, Beza, Buchanan, and other Latin and Italian Authors, sufficiently manifest. Nay, further in several of his Plays he has borrow'd many Ornaments from the Ancients ; as more particularly in his Plays call'd *The Ages*, he has intersperst several Things, borrow'd from Homer, Virgil, Ovid, Seneca, Plautus, &c., which extreamly set them off.

Langbaine starts listing Heywood's plays with the *Ages* "because . . . on another score they deserve the Preference, as being accounted by most the Flower of all his Plays." He pays no individual attention to the rest of the plays, which include several apocryphal items. Gildon violently objected to Langbaine's favourable approval of Heywood. He admits, however, that *The Fair Maid of the West* enjoyed good repute "in those Times" and "afterwards serv'd for the Subject of a Romance, calied, The English Lover, writ by John Dancer, one of our foregoing authors." ‡ Jacob Giles, of course, repeated Gildon's evaluation of Heywood and criticism of Langbaine almost verbatim. §

* Pp. 176-177, ed. of 1675. Mr. Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 141, in novel fashion argues that Phillips used for his *Theatrum Poetarum* a manuscript version of Heywood's own lost *Lives of All the Poets* ! Mr. Clark puts remarkable credence in a parallel passage and comments : " . . . we cannot doubt that Phillips had Heywood's MS. in his possession."

† Gerard Langbaine, *An Account of the English Dramatic Poets* (Oxford, 1691), p. 258.

‡ Charles Gildon, *The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatic Poets* (London), 1699, pp. 70-72. Of Langbaine, Gildon comments that he had praised Heywood and slandered Dryden, "enough to render his Judgment very much suspected, and that the Variety of Plays he had read either corrupted his Taste, or else that he never had any."

§ *The Poetical Register, or the Lives and Characters of the English Dramatic Poets* (London, 1719), pp. 134-138.

THOMAS HEYWOOD'S LATER REPUTATION 139

The eighteenth century did little to refurbish Heywood's reputation. Late in the century, however, there was a renewal of interest in the old dramatist with at least two successful play revivals. In spite of eighteenth-century interest in domestic drama, *A Woman Killed with Kindness* seems to have been overlooked until very late. Professor Nicoll * sees no trace of Heywood's *Edward IV.* in Rowe's *Jane Shore*, a handling of the same material as that in the earlier play. Rowe, nevertheless, claimed to have "Written in Imitation of Shakespeare's Style"; he had an interest in the Elizabethans and may have obtained at least a suggestion from Heywood's play.

The underplot of *Edward IV.* was adapted in 1788 by F. G. Waldron as *The King in the Country*, and performed successfully at the Theatre Royal, at Richmond, and at Windsor. The prologue announces: †

. . . and crave you to accept a Story
Of our Fourth Edward, England's glory,
And a blunt Tanner; long since writ
By Thomas Heywood, a Stage-Wit:
Antique the phrase, and coarse the manners,
Yet such as suited Kings and Tanners
Who lived three hundred years ago.

In an advertisement Waldron says the piece "was compiled and performed last summer, immediately on His Majesty's return from Cheltenham; when Entertainments of various kinds were exhibited at the different Places of Public Amusement, having relation to the Royal Excursion." †

The Fair Maid of the West was adapted in 1791 by Stephen Kemble as *The Northern Inn; or, The Good Times of Queen Bess* for Mrs. Kemble's benefit of August 16. He used the main plot and much of the dialogue. The adaptation was not published.

An unacted adaptation of *A Woman Killed with Kindness* appeared

* *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama* (Cambridge, 1925), p. 101: "Heywood, of course, had been even earlier in the field with semi-domestic drama of the same kind, but Heywood no one remembered in those years."

† Reprinted in Waldron's *The Literary Museum or, Ancient and Modern Repository* (London, 1792).

‡ In adapting the play, Waldron had used J. P. Kemble's copy. Apparently Kemble, a book collector as well as an actor, had an interest in Heywood. In the Treasure Room of the Widener Library at Harvard are several copies of Heywood's plays, bearing notations in Kemble's hand and once a part of his collection. In the foreword to his *Literary Museum*, addressed to Kemble, Waldron says: "I take the liberty now to thank you for the use of Heywood's *King Edward the Fourth*, from your very curious collection; and as you are generally known to unite the elegant antiquary with the accomplished Actor, to inscribe to you this Volume."

in 1776 as *The Fatal Error* by Benjamin Victor. Victor, it seems, was impressed with the sentimental possibilities of the play and altered it to suit his own taste. In the preface to *The Fatal Error* he makes an interesting and significant comment : *

In the year 1743, the late Mr. Dodsley publish'd his collection of old Plays, in twelve volumes, to which I was a subscriber. Among them I read a Tragedy with a strange title, call'd, *A Woman kill'd with kindness*, in which were several fine strokes of nature, on matrimonial distress, brought in by female infidelity. But where the seducer brings the wife to consent, who is happily situated with a young, fond, accomplished husband, it is hardly possible to render her an object of pity, or the husband approved for his excessive tenderness, and forgiveness to such a criminal—I was, therefore, led to invent the following fable ; and have only borrowed a few lines from the old play, in the last scene, where the husbands forgiveness, and renew'd affection, will, I hope, be thought by the reader to be founded on humanity.

Although *A Woman Killed with Kindness* did not reach the stage, the late eighteenth century was finding in the old play a literary interest. A long and rather sensible criticism of it appears in the *Biographia Dramatica*.† The writer anticipates Lamb in feeling a Shakespearean touch in certain of the scenes :

It [I ?] cannot help looking on this play as one of the best of this author's writing. For although there is, perhaps, too much perplexity in it, arising from the variety of incidents which are blended together, yet there are some scenes and numberless speeches in it which would have done no dishonour to the pen of Shakespeare himself.

Of Mrs. Frankford, he continues :

But nothing can be finer than her consciousness of guilt, her remorse, and self-accusations after it ; and the manner of her death, in consequence of her husband's lenity and affection, is beautifully conceived, and finely executed, and leaves us still prejudiced in favour of a character, which, in the former parts of the play, everyone must have been attached to by the most rational partiality. In a word, was this part of the plot to be modernized by some able hand, it might undoubtedly furnish materials for a very fine tragedy.

In addition to the Dodsley reprints, the end of the century saw a new edition of *Love's Mistress*, brought out by T. Wilkins in 1792.

* Benjamin Victor, *Original Letters, Dramatic Pieces, and Poems* (London. 1776), p. 81.

† In the adaptation, poetic justice is meted out. The false friend is conveniently slain by a mutual acquaintance, and it is carefully shown that the wife did not willingly sin, but committed "a fatal error" in keeping quiet after her shame.

† *Biographia Dramatica*. Continuation to 1782 by I. Reed, vol. ii, pp. 409-410.

The Life of Merlin seems to have been remembered when dramatic works were forgotten. Extracts from it were used in *The Rarities of Richmond* by E. C. (1736) * and a condensed version appeared in 1755 as *The Life of Merlin : Merlin's Life and Prophecies*.

The antiquarian interest of the early nineteenth century resulted in awakening an interest in Heywood, along with many other half-forgotten Elizabethans. Lamb's opinion of the "prose Shakespeare" is too well known to need repeating. William Hazlitt was another of Heywood's admirers. His comment on Heywood's prose may be compared with Lamb's yearning for a little more poetry : †

His style is equally natural, simple, and unconstrained. The dialogue (bating the verse) is such as might be uttered in ordinary conversation. It is beautiful prose put into heroic measure.

An anonymous and one of the most complete critiques of Heywood's plays up to that time appeared in the *Retrospective Review* in 1825.‡ The dramatist is praised for such plays as *A Woman Killed with Kindness* and *The English Traveller* while he is damned for *Edward IV*, *If You Know Not Me*, etc. There is unexpected praise of Heywood's refinement :

Heywood's best comedies are distinguished by a peculiar air, a superior manner ; his gentlemen are the most refined and finished of gentlemen, refined in their nice sense of the true and beautiful, their fine moral perception, and finished in the most scrupulous attention to polite manners, most exact in the observances of decorum, without appearing rigorously precise—ductile as fused gold to that which is good, and unmalleable to that which is evil ; men, in short, " of most erected spirits."

Love's Mistress is " the most beautiful and purest of masques founded upon classical mythology." *The Rape of Lucrece* contains " sparks of genius." *The English Traveller* " abounds with good scenes, good writing, and excellent sentiment, and is distinguished by pure, gentle, and attractive characters—Heywood's characters." Then follows this remarkable encomium of the dramatist's characters, praise which without doubt would have pleased but somewhat puzzled Heywood himself :

They are perfectly natural, and yet appear to belong to a superior

* Clark, *op. cit.*, 135. Mr. Clark also lists the edition of the *Apology for Actors* in the *Somers Tracts* (1750) and Colley Cibber's borrowings from the *Apology* in his *Dissertations on Theatrical Subjects* (1756 and 1759) among the eighteenth-century publications of Heywood's works.

† *Lectures*, p. 44.

‡ *The Retrospective Review*, vol. ii (1825), 123-160.

order to any which we see in ordinary life, not in reach of intellect, but in sweetness of disposition and perfection of moral character, the influence of which is diffused over the whole of the dialogues of his best plays.

These beautiful souls are exemplified by Mr. Generous in *The Late Lancashire Witches*, "two or three characters" in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, Young Geraldine in *The English Traveller*, and other similar types. The latter play is described as admirable "for beauty and simplicity, and for noble innocence of feeling." Of *The Royal King and the Loyal Subject* the author of the essay "cannot say so much for the moral of it. It is a perfect sample of loyal non-resistance." *A Woman Killed with Kindness* provokes the most fulsome praise. "This is the most tearful of tragedies; the most touching in story; the most pathetic in detail." It raises in the reader's breast, "a sea of troubles; a sympathy the most engrossing; a grief the most profound. We are overwhelmed with the emotion of the unhappy sufferers, and are carried along in the stream of distress, incapable of resistance, and unconscious of anything but the scene before us." The play serves "as an awful beacon to warn the pure and inexperienced." "The most phlegmatic in feeling, the most obtuse in understanding, cannot remain unaffected; it must emphatically come home to men's business and bosoms." Such superlative praise had never been awarded Heywood before, not even by the most flattering of his friends.

Not all the early nineteenth century critics agreed with the appreciative writer for the *Retrospective Review*. Sir Walter Scott had no liking for Heywood, if indeed he had read his plays at all. In a note on Dryden's reference to Heywood and Shirley in *Mac-flecknoe*,* he comments:

His plays may be examined with advantage by the antiquary, but afford slender amusement to the lovers of poetry. . . . It is a pity . . . so fruitful a tree should have borne only crabs.

Scott thinks Dryden most unjustly couples Shirley with Heywood.

The first half of the nineteenth century saw the reprinting of Heywood's most important plays by Dilke, Scott, Baldwin,† Barron

* Dryden, *Works*, x, p. 441.

† Some of the criticism of the early editors is worth noting. Charles Baldwin, in his edition of *The Rape of Lucrece* in *The Old English Drama*, vol. i (1825), comments: "The Rape of Lucrece is a sort of dramatic monster, in the construction of which every rule of propriety is violated, and all grace and symmetry are set at defiance. The author, one would suppose, must have produced it when in a state of inebriety; in which a man of genius may frequently, amidst strange and

Field, and Collier. Sir Edgerton Brydges even saw fit to reproduce the introductory matter and part of the first canto of *Troia Britanica** and portions of the *Hierarchie of the Blessed Angells*.† These reprints, with Pearson's collected edition of the plays in 1874, assured Heywood of at least a library acquaintanceship. Since his "re-discovery" by the early nineteenth-century antiquaries, Heywood has grown somewhat in favour with students of the Elizabethan drama. The opinions of later critics, Swinburne, Symonds, Stevenson, and others, are too well known and easily accessible to need repetition here.

The interest of the early nineteenth century in Heywood was chiefly antiquarian and literary. Not until 1887 was he given a new stage hearing. On March 8 of that year the Dramatic Students' Society acted at the Olympia Theatre, London, *A Woman Killed with Kindness*.‡ The play was a success. In a critical review of the play in *The Theatre*, Frank Marshall says of the pathos :

Many persons, who knew the play merely from reading it, must have been surprised to see how Act III affected to tears even men who are not given, as a rule, to such emotion. There is a directness about Heywood's style in his more emotional scenes, which goes straight to the heart ; and he possesses one quality sadly lacking in many of our countrymen who write for the stage in the present day, he is thoroughly English.

foolish things, give birth to poetical and impassioned conceptions. The dignified characters of Roman story are, in this play, really infected with the madness which Brutus only assumes. But, with an exuberance of buffoonery and conceits, are mingled a considerable portion of poetry and some powerful scenes. Upon the whole, this singular composition, with all its absurdities, contains so much that is really excellent, that it is well worthy of forming a part of this collection."

The same editor further comments in the introduction to his reprint of *Love's Mistress* (1824) that many of Heywood's plays are tainted with buffoonery, but "This author has, however, left a few plays behind him, which are not only free from the objections before mentioned, but arrive at a high degree of perfection in domestic art ; such as : *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, *The English Traveller*, *A Challenge for Beauty*, *The Royal King and Loyal Subject*, and *Fortune by Land and Sea*. In the next grade we may place *Love's Mistress*, *The Rape of Lucrece*, and *The Lancashire Witches*. The rest of his plays . . . are of a very inferior order."

C. W. Dilke, in his edition of *The Royal King and the Loyal Subject* in *Old English Plays*, vol. vi (1815), takes Heywood to task for historical inaccuracy in the character of the marshal whom he identifies as Bigod under Edward I. He compares Heywood's play with Fletcher's *The Loyal Subject* to the discredit of the former.

* *Restituta* (London, 1815), vol. ii, pp. 141 ff.

† *Ibid.*, vol. i (1814), pp. 249 ff.

‡ Frank Marshall, *A Woman Killed with Kindness. The Theatre*, xviii (1887) 205-212, mentions an early unacted adaptation of the play by John Moser. It was printed in 1810 in the *European Magazine* under the title, "Ingratitude : or the Adulteress."

... But what may be called the Anglo-Saxon vigour of Heywood's most powerful scene is much impaired by the sacrifices which have to be made to the prudery of the present day.

Heywood's *Edward IV* was included in Thomas Donovan's *English Historical Plays* (London, 1896), 2 vols., a collection arranged for acting as well as reading. *Fortune by Land and Sea* was produced in 1899 by the Harvard chapter of Delta Upsilon. The text was prepared and published by Janet Edmondson Waller. *The Fair Maid of the West*, pt. 1, was revived at the Hyperion Theatre in New Haven on April 23 and 24, 1901 by the Yale Dramatic Association. *A Woman Killed with Kindness* was revived in New York in 1914, and in April 1922 in England at the Birmingham Repertory Theatre. An English revival of *The Fair Maid of the West*, pt. 1, was staged in April 1920 at the Lyric Theatre, Hammersmith, by the Phoenix Society. These productions have again proved the quality of Heywood's theatrical appeal. Some day, perhaps, the voracious motion picture industry will seize on *The Fair Maid of the West*, and old Heywood will have a ghostly resurrection among the shadows of the screen.

THE FRANKLIN

By K. L. WOOD-LEGH

IN his recent work, *Some New Light on Chaucer*, Professor Manly has advanced the theory that many of the Canterbury Pilgrims represent particular persons known to Chaucer and to those for whom he wrote, and by searching the records of the period, he has endeavoured, with considerable success it would appear, to find the originals of the poet's characters. This view is deserving of most careful consideration, and although the discussion of such matters belongs mainly to literary critics, the identification of the Canterbury Pilgrims is a problem in which students of history may also claim a share, for on the answer given to the question whether the Canterbury Pilgrims represent types or individuals their value as illustrations of contemporary life will largely depend. Moreover, the search for the originals of these characters raises problems on which those familiar with particular aspects of fourteenth-century history may be able to throw some light. One of these problems, the identification of the Franklin, forms the subject of the present paper in which, after discussing the reasons which led Professor Manly to conclude that John Bussy was the original of the Franklin, I shall consider briefly the more important question of how far the Franklin was typical of his class.

Professor Manly's identification of the Franklin with John Bussy depends upon two main arguments; that the description of the Franklin's activities could accurately be applied to him and that he was a neighbour of Thomas de Pynchbek "to whom the evidence has pointed as the original of the Sergeant of the Law." * That Thomas de Pynchbek and John Bussy came from the same locality is undoubtedly true, but this fact seems to have led Professor Manly to overlook certain difficulties which arise when one tries to apply to Bussy the lines describing the Franklin.

* *Some New Light on Chaucer*, p. 159.

In the first place, the Franklin's white beard implies that he is advanced in years, and this suggestion is strengthened by the lines in which he compares his own son unfavourably with the Squire.

I have a sone, and, by the Trinitee,
I hadde lever than twenty pound worth lond,
Though it right now were fallen in myn hond,
He were a man of swich discrecioun
As that ye been ! . . .
But for to pleye at dees, and to despende,
And lese al that he hath, is his usage.
And he hath lever talken with a page
Than to comune with any gentil wight
Ther he mighte lerne gentillesse aright.*

My efforts to discover the age of John Bussy have not been successful, but as he does not appear to have been engaged in any public business until 1381, when he was commissioned with others in Lincolnshire to take measures to resist and punish the insurgent peasants,† it may be doubted whether at the time when the Prologue was written he was old enough to serve as the model of the Franklin.

More serious objections to John Bussy, as the original of the Franklin, are aroused by an examination of his public career. He had, indeed, served as sheriff of Lincolnshire from November 1383 to November 1384, October 1385 to November 1386, and from November 1390 to October 1391,‡ and as justice of the peace in 1382, 1384, 1390, and 1392,§ but was he "Ful ofte tyme . . . knight of the shire"? With reference to this Professor Manly says, "He was knight of the shire in 1383, 1388, and in every other parliament in Richard's reign." || But attendances after the Prologue was written are of no importance for the present purpose.

If the Prologue was composed in 1387, John Bussy had at the time been present in one parliament; if it was written in 1390 or 1391, the period which Professor Manly appears to favour,¶ three or four more parliaments, those of November 1388, January 1390, November 1390, and November 1391, may be added to those in which Bussy had served; and if it was composed in 1393, the latest date to which it can be ascribed, Bussy would have attended one more parliament, that which met in January 1393. Thus it appears

* *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. W. W. Skeat, 1894, vol. iv. pp. 480-1.

† *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1381-1385, p. 70.

‡ *List of Sheriffs for England and Wales* (P.R.O. Lists and Indexes, No. IX.), p. 79.

§ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1381-1385, pp. 254, 502; 1388-1392, pp. 345, 526.

|| *Some New Light on Chaucer*, p. 162.

¶ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

that the highest number of attendances that can be attributed to John Bussy prior to the composition of the Prologue is six, and that four or five is more probably the correct number; but it can hardly be said that a man who had served in one, four, five or even six parliaments was "ful ofte tyme knight of the shire."

Moreover, Chaucer's Franklin had been a "Countour." Professor Manly does not discuss the meaning of this word or make any suggestion as to what office it denoted. In the *New English Dictionary*, the definition given for "Countour" is "An accountant, an officer who appears to have assisted in early times in collecting or auditing the county dues"; and Professor Skeat in the *Glossarial Index* to his edition of Chaucer's Complete Works, suggests that it may mean auditor. What office Chaucer used it to designate is not clear, but the term might well be applied to a man appointed to survey the work of the tax-collectors and to inquire into their misconduct, as that was an office of considerable responsibility to which many country gentlemen of the period were appointed, though John Bussy does not seem to have been one of them.

For these reasons it seems unlikely that Chaucer had John Bussy in mind when he depicted the Franklin, and the difficulty of accepting him as the original of that character increases when it is observed how many men there were at the time whose public activities could, with equal or greater accuracy, have been described by the same lines.

In his preliminary selection of seven men: William Wade of Rutland, Simon de Leek of Nottinghamshire, Robert de la Mare of Wiltshire, Thomas de Fulnetby of Lincolnshire, Nicholas de Styvecle of Huntingdonshire, Peter de Tilliol of Cumberland, and John Bussy, who deserve consideration as possible originals of the Franklin,* Professor Manly seems to have been under the impression that during the Middle Ages very few men attended parliament frequently, and that, therefore, those contemporaries of Chaucer whose high records of attendance had happened to attract his attention were probably the only men possessing this distinction: but Mr. J. G. Edwards in his article on "The Personnel of the Commons under Edward I. and Edward II." † has proved that, even at that early date, re-election occurred much more frequently

* *Some New Light on Chaucer*, p. 160.

† In *Essays in Mediæval History Presented to Thomas Frederick Tout*, Manchester, 1925.

than has generally been supposed, and high records of attendance became increasingly common as the century advanced. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that, if numerous attendances in parliament is to be the first principle governing the choice of possible models of the Franklin, there are many besides the seven named above who ought to be considered.

Furthermore, Professor Manly does not appear to have realised how constantly fourteenth-century country gentlemen were occupied with public business such as that in which the Franklin had been engaged. A statistical study of the connection with the local administration of the knights of the shire during the reign of Edward III., which I have based on a comparison of the names of those appointed to fill the various local offices, as given in the Calendars of Patent and of Fine Rolls, with the names of those returned to represent the counties, shows that of the 1636 who during that period were returned to parliament for the shires, 125 served as escheators, 371 were collectors of tenths and fifteenths, 318 held the office of sheriff, and 641 were appointed justices of the peace. The class from which the knights of the shire and the officers of local government were drawn was small, and consequently the public duties committed to individuals were often numerous. In the parliament of 1376, which is no exception to the general rule, nine of the county representatives had previously served as sheriffs and justices of the peace; three more, besides holding these offices, had been collectors of direct taxes; and another had added the office of escheator to the three already named; another knight had been a collector of taxes and a commissioner of the peace; and another had held all the offices except that of sheriff. With regard to this point, it is worth noting that the claims of three of those whom Professor Manly mentioned as possible originals of the Franklin, but rejected because he failed to find that they had held all the required offices, are better than he believed. William Wade was a justice of the peace in 1344, 1351 and 1361* and sheriff of Rutland from January 1362 to Michaelmas 1363; Simon de Leek was sheriff of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire from November 1363 to November 1364, and from November 1379 to October 1380; and Thomas de Fulnetby, sheriff of Lincolnshire from February 1355 to October 1358, and from November 1368 to August 1372.†

* *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1343-1345, p. 393; 1350-1354, p. 90; 1361-1364, p. 66.

† *List of Sheriffs*, pp. 112, 103, 79.

These three, however, and also Nicholas de Styvecle and Robert de la Mare, may be passed over as having ended their public activities too long before the writing of the Prologue, and attention may be concentrated upon men who can be proved to have been alive and active at the time when Chaucer was writing. Even of these a selection must be made, for those who might be suggested are so numerous that to discuss all would be tedious and unprofitable; and therefore the present study will be limited to the knights in a single parliament, that which began on the first of October 1386. It is strange that Professor Manly, who rightly emphasises Chaucer's powers of observation, and who believes that his characters represent persons whom he had known, seems not to have thought of looking for the Franklin among the members of this parliament in which Chaucer himself was knight of the shire. Among his fellows on that occasion there were five knights each of whom would seem to be a more fitting original of the Franklin than is John Bussy. Gilbert Wace of Oxfordshire had been returned to eight parliaments prior to that in which he served with Chaucer.* He was sheriff of Oxfordshire and Berkshire from November 1371 to December 1372; December 1374 to October 1375; November 1379 to October 1380, and from November 1387 to December 1388,† and was appointed justice of the peace for Oxfordshire in a number of commissions from 1375 to 1383.‡ William Flaumville first represented Leicestershire in 1362, and in 1386 he was serving in that capacity for the tenth time.§ He was sheriff of Warwickshire and Leicestershire from November 1379 to October 1380,|| and justice of the peace for Leicestershire in 1381, 1382, 1383, 1384, 1386, 1389 and 1390.¶ William Boneville, a man of considerable importance at the time, was returned for Devon to the parliaments of 1371, 1376, October 1378, April 1379, November 1380, 1381, May 1382, October 1382, and April 1384, and for Somerset, to those of 1366, October 1383, April 1384, November 1384, and 1386.**

* *Return of Members of Parliament*, I., pp. 189, 196, 213, 215, 218, 221, 223, 226, 229.

† *List of Sheriffs*, p. 108.

‡ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1374-1377, p. 136; 1377-1381, pp. 46, 301; 1381-1385, pp. 195, 347.

§ *Return of Members of Parliament*, I., pp. 170, 177, 184, 193, 196, 198, 208, 210, 220, 228.

|| *List of Sheriffs*, p. 145.

¶ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1377-1381, p. 572; 1381-1385, pp. 252, 255, 347; 1385-1389, p. 254; 1389-1392, pp. 136, 343.

** *Return of Members of Parliament*, I., pp. 184, 193, 199, 202, 206, 208, 210, 212, 220, and pp. 178, 218, 221, 223, 229.

He was sheriff of Devonshire from November 1389 to November 1390, and of Somersetshire and Dorsetshire from November 1381 to November 1382; * in 1366, 1376, 1377, 1380, 1381 and 1384 he served as justice of the peace.† Thomas Sackville was knight of the shire for Buckingham in twelve parliaments between October 1377 and October 1386; ‡ was sheriff of Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire from November 1380 to November 1381, and from November 1389 to November 1390,§ and justice of the peace in 1377, 1380, 1385, 1389, and 1390.|| Stephen de Hales represented Norfolk in nine parliaments from January 1377 to October 1386; ¶ was sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk from November 1378 to November 1379,** and commissioner of the peace in Norfolk in 1386, 1388, 1389, and 1390.††

It is to be noted also that the three last-named men had all served as surveyors of taxes: William Boneville and Thomas Sackville in 1379, and Stephen de Hales and William Boneville in 1380,‡‡ and this office may be the one which Chaucer designated by the term "Countour."

Chaucer's lines then may be regarded as giving a fairly accurate account of the public activities of any of these men; but the Franklin is represented as coming to the Tabard in company with the Sergeant of the Law whom Professor Manly believes to have been Thomas de Pynchbek, and, although any one of the five may well have been brought into contact with him, there seems to be only one whose association with Pynchbek can now be proved. This is Stephen de Hales, who in July 1386 was appointed with Pynchbek and others to inquire into a complaint made by the inhabitants of South Lenn that they had been compelled to contribute towards the fortification and defence of Lenn,§§ and who, after that time, served with Pynchbek on a number of commissions of the peace in Norfolk.||||

* *List of Sheriffs*, pp. 35, 123.

† *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1364-1367, p. 285; 1374-1377, p. 313; 1377-1381, pp. 46, 513, 572; 1381-1385, p. 502.

‡ *Return of Members of Parliament*, I., pp. 197, 199, 201, 206, 210, 212, 214, 217, 219, 222, 225, 228.

§ *List of Sheriffs*, p. 2.

|| *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1377-1381, pp. 45, 513; 1385-1389, p. 81; 1388-1392, pp. 136, 343.

¶ *Return of Members of Parliament*, I., pp. 196, 204, 208, 210, 212, 215, 218, 223, 229.

** *List of Sheriffs*, p. 87.

†† *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1385-1389, pp. 82, 545; 1388-1392, pp. 135, 342.

‡‡ *Cal. Fine Rolls*, vol. ix., pp. 162, 163, 229.

§§ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1385-1389, p. 254.

|||| *Ibid.*, 1385-1389, p. 545; 1388-1392, pp. 135, 524.

But whether the Franklin represents Stephen de Hales or some other country gentleman, the foregoing study has, I hope, made it clear that his identification must be determined by characteristics more personal than his tenure of local offices or his parliamentary service ; and even if it be satisfactorily established that a particular individual was the original, he must have been an individual who had so much in common with others of his class and time that he may continue to be regarded as a type

ACT-DIVISIONS IN SHAKESPEARE

BY W. W. GREG

I WRITE, not with any desire to butt into the controversy between Sir Mark Hunter and Professor Dover Wilson, but merely to place certain facts at the disposal of the disputants.

To begin with, however, I should like to clear up a slight misconception in Professor Wilson's article. It is, namely, not quite correct to imply that all the extant theatrical "plots" belonged to the Admiral's company.* Whatever may be its exact date, there is little doubt that the plot of 2 *Seven Deadly Sins* was prepared for a performance by Strange's men (or, on Sir Edmund Chambers' hypothesis, perhaps by a Strange-Admiral's combination). In this plot the division is very clear, for two of the three "plays within the play" have been cut in half by an entry of the chorus, evidently in order to obtain a five-act structure for the whole. The connexion of Strange's with the later Chamberlain's men—Shakespeare's company—is of course a moot point, but there can be no doubt as to some substantial community of personnel between the plot and the Chamberlain's servants, and so far as this implies a continuity of tradition, the evidence points to act-divisions being not wholly alien from Shakespeare's circle. At the same time it must not be forgotten that, though the plot of the *Sins* was prepared for Strange's men, the play itself originally belonged to the Queen's company.

This by the way. What I really want to establish is the extent to which act-divisions are marked in the printed plays of the period. According to Sir Mark Hunter, "Of the two hundred odd copies of plays examined by me for the purpose of this study, the percentage of those which conform to the plan [of five acts] approaches seventy." This very vague statement is justly criticised by Mr. Dover Wilson,

* He also says that the "plots" are preserved at Dulwich, a statement which is not accurate in the present tense, though it might be in the past. Only one is now at Dulwich; five are in the British Museum; one is only known from the "*Variorum*" Shakespeare.

who would evidently like to reverse the percentage. I suspect that Sir Mark may have meant something different from what Mr. Wilson assumes, but it should anyhow be of interest to get down to the material facts of the case, since both disputants are admittedly relying on rather imperfect data. Incidentally, I may remark, that if it were true that 70 per cent of contemporary plays were printed with act-divisions, the fact that not one of the editions of Shakespeare's plays issued in his lifetime was so divided, would hardly allow us to escape the conclusion that they were in fact exceptional, and did not conform to the normal plan.

The following is a list of all the extant plays which I believe to have been printed during the twenty years from 1591 to 1610, arranged, to the best of my ability, in chronological order, and distinguishing those which show clear, or at least probable, indications of division into acts from those that show none. I have marked with a star (*) those plays, generally of academic, courtly, or learned origin, which were clearly not written to be acted in the ordinary theatres, whether public or private. Further, I have placed a dagger (†) against those pieces which are known to have been written for children's companies and acted in the private theatres.

DIVIDED	UNDIVIDED
*Amyntas' Pastoral (Fraunce).	1591 1 & 2 Troublesome Reign of King John.
†Endymion.	
	1592
†Galathea.	Arden of Feversham.
†Midas.	Fair Em.
*Tancred and Gismund.	
*Antonius (Mary Sidney).	
Soliman and Perseda. ¹	
The Spanish Tragedy. ²	
	1593
	Edward I.
	1594
Jack Straw. ³	A Knack to Know a Knave.
*Cornelia (Kyd).	Titus Andronicus.
The Wounds of Civil War. ⁴	A Looking Glass for London.
†Mother Bombe.	The First Part of the Contention.
The Battle of Alcazar. ⁵	The Taming of a Shrew.

¹ The acts are not formally marked, but the play is divided into five by four entrances of the chorus.

² Divided into four acts only, but this is probably an error.

³ Divided into four acts.

⁴ The division is irregular.

⁵ The division is very defective.

DIVIDED

†Dido.
*Cleopatra (Daniel).

*Menaechmi.
Locrine.

The Woman in the Moon.

*The Virtuous Octavia.
James IV.

A Warning for Fair Women.³
Alphonsus of Aragon.

Every Man out of his Humour.
†The Maid's Metamorphosis.
†Dr. Dodypoll.

UNDIVIDED

1594
Friar Bacon.
Orlando Furioso.
The Cobler's Prophecy.
The True Tragedy of Richard III.
Edward II.
Selimus.
†The Wars of Cyrus.
The Massacre at Paris.

1595
The Pedlar's Prophecy.
The Old Wives Tale.
The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York.

1596
A Knack to Know an Honest Man.
Edward III.

1597
Richard II.
Richard III.
Romeo and Juliet.¹

1598
1 Henry IV.
The Blind Beggar of Alexandria.
The Famous Victories of Henry V.
Love's Labour's Lost.
Mucedorus.

1599
1 & 2 Edward IV.
Clyomon and Clamydes.
George a Green.
An Humorous Day's Mirth.
David and Bethsabe.²
The Two Angry Women of Abingdon.

1600
Old Fortunatus.⁴
Henry V.⁵
Sir John Oldcastle.
2 Henry IV.
Much Ado about Nothing.
A Midsummer-Night's Dream.
The Weakest Goeth to the Wall.
The Merchant of Venice.
*Summer's Last Will.
Look about You.
The Shoemakers Holiday.

¹ Some scene-divisions are indicated in Qr.

² Doubtful: the play is only divided by three dumb shows.

³ There is a heading "5. Chorus" on the second of two entrances, which may point to an original division into acts. Though printed from a prompt copy there is some dislocation of the text.

⁴ The only hint of division is afforded by two entrances of the chorus.

⁵ There is no chorus in the Q. version.

ACT-DIVISIONS IN SHAKESPEARE

155

DIVIDED

Every Man in his Humour.
†Jack Drum's Entertainment.
†Love's Metamorphosis.
†Cynthia's Revels.

*Il Pastor Fido.
†Antonio and Mellida.
†Antonio's Revenge.
†Poetaster.
Liberty and Prodigality.

*Darius (Alexander).

†The Malcontent.
*Croesus.

†The Dutch Courtesan.
Sejanus his Fall.
†Eastward Ho.
†All Fools.
*Philotas (Daniel).

*The Return from Parnassus.
The Gentleman Usher.
*The Queen's Arcadia.
†Sir Giles Goosecap.
†Parasitaster.
†The Wonder of Women.
*Caesar and Pompey (anon.).
†The Isle of Gulls.⁴
†Monsieur D'Olive.

UNDIVIDED

1601

The Downfall of Robert Earl of
Huntingdon.
The Death of Robert Earl of H.¹
Two Lamentable Tragedies.

1602

†Satiromastix.
The Merry Wives of Windsor.
†Blurt Master-Constable.
How to Choose a Wife.
A Larum for London.
*A Satire of Three Estates.
Thomas Lord Cromwell.²

1603

Hamlet.
Patient Grissil (Dekker, etc.).
*Philotas (anon.).

1604

1 The Honest Whore.³
Doctor Faustus.⁴
The Wit of a Woman.

1605

The Trial of Chivalry.
The Fair Maid of Bristow.
When you See me.
King Leir (anon.).
1 If you Know not Me.
Captain Thomas Stukeley.⁵
The First Part of Jeronimo.
The London Prodigal.

1606

2 If you Know not Me.
Nobody and Somebody.
Wily Beguiled.

¹ Divided only as far as Scene v.

² There are two entrances of the chorus.

³ There is an imperfect division into scenes only.

⁴ There is one entrance of the chorus in the course of the play.

⁵ According to Fleay, "It was meant to contain one act in London, one in Ireland, one in Portugal, one in Rome, and one in Africa, but the Rome part has been clumsily cut out," and in any case should surely have preceded the Portuguese. Anyhow no trace of division remains.

⁶ Acts III and IV are not marked.

DIVIDED

- *Lingua.
- †Michaelmas Term.
- †The Woman Hater.
- †Bussy D'Ambois.
- †Cupid's Whirligig.
- †Northward Ho.
- †The Puritan.
- †What you Will.
- The Revenger's Tragedy.¹
- The Devil's Charter.
- †The Fleer (Sharpham).
- Volpone.
- †Westward Ho.
- *The Alexandrian Tragedy.
- *Julius Caesar (Alexander).

- †A Trick to Catch the Old One.
- †The Family of Love.
- †Your Five Gallants.
- †Law-Tricks.
- †Humour out of Breath.
- †The Conspiracy of Biron.
- †The Tragedy of Biron.
- †A Mad World my Masters.
- †The Dumb Knight.

- *Mustapha.
- †The Case is Altered.²

- †The Turk (Mason).
- The Faithful Shepherdess.
- †Histriomastix.⁴

UNDIVIDED

1607

- *Claudius Tiberius Nero.
- The Whore of Babylon.
- The Fair Maid of the Exchange.
- †The Phoenix.
- The Travels of Three Brothers.
- The Miseries of Enforced Marriage.
- Sir Thomas Wyat.
- A Woman Killed with Kindness.

1608

- The Merry Devil of Edmonton.
- King Lear (Shakespeare).
- A Yorkshire Tragedy.
- The Rape of Lucrece.

1609

- Troilus and Cressida.
- Every Woman in her Humour.
- Pericles.³
- †The Two Maids of Moreclacke.

1610

- †The Turk (Mason).
- The Faithful Shepherdess.
- †Histriomastix.⁴

Thus in the two most relevant decades we find 80 first editions showing fairly clear evidence of act-division and 92 undivided. Thus, in place of the suggested 70 per cent of divided plays, we find that an examination of the original editions yields under 50, actually about 46.5, per cent. If we confine our attention to plays intended for the regular stage (omitting, that is, the starred pieces) the numbers of divided and undivided are 62 and 88 respectively. These give a proportion for undivided plays of close on 60 per cent (58.6 to be exact). If we now eliminate the children's plays, the figures take on a very different aspect, for there are 43 daggers in

¹ Divided into four acts, the heading of the fifth being accidentally omitted.

² The division extends only as far as III. i.

³ There are six entrances of Gower as chorus, thrice with a dumb show.

⁴ Divided into six acts.

the divided list and only 5 in the undivided. We have left then 19 divided plays and 83 undivided. The total being 102, these figures may be taken as representing percentages. Moreover, there are certainly more children's plays in the divided list than we have allowed for: *Liberality and Prodigality*, *The Gentleman Usher*, and *The Faithful Shepherdess* are almost certainly such, though actual record is lacking. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the undivided plays include an uncertain number of abridged and mutilated texts which have probably lost any act-structure they may once have possessed.* Perhaps the two unknowns cancel out. In any case we can hardly be far wrong in saying that, of plays acted by men's companies in the public theatres, the undivided texts are four times as numerous as the divided.

Finally, it may be worth while examining those plays which, as originally published, were assigned to one or other of the two leading men's companies, namely, the Strange-Chamberlain-King's organisation on the one hand, and the Admiral-Prince's on the other. There are, of course, many other pieces that we can confidently assign to these groups, but I propose to confine myself here to the explicit evidence of the title-pages.

CHAMBERLAIN'S, ETC.

DIVIDED

A Warning for Fair Women, 1599.
Every Man in his Humour, 1601.
The Revenger's Tragedy, 1607.
The Devil's Charter, 1607.

UNDIVIDED

Fair Em, 1592.
A Larum for London, 1602.
Thomas Lord Cromwell, 1602.
The London Prodigal, 1605.
The Miseries of Enforced Marriage, 1607.
The Merry Devil of Edmonton, 1608.
A Yorkshire Tragedy, 1608.
 Shakespeare's plays, thirteen in all, 1594-1609.

ADMIRAL'S, PRINCE'S

DIVIDED

The Wounds of Civil War, 1594.
The Battle of Alcazar, 1594.

UNDIVIDED

The Massacre at Paris, 1594.
The Blind Beggar of Alexandria, 1598.
An Humorous Day's Mirth, 1599.
Two Angry Women of Abingdon, 1599.
Old Fortunatus, 1600.
Sir John Oldcastle, 1600.
Look about You, 1600.
The Shoemakers Holiday, 1600.
The Downfall of R. Earl of H., 1601.
The Death of R. Earl of H., 1601.
Patient Grissil, 1603.
Doctor Faustus, 1604.
When you See me, 1605.
The Whore of Babylon, 1607.

It should be observed that *A Warning for Fair Women* is not formally divided and even the intention is far from certain, while

* However, *Jack Straw*, which certainly belongs to this class, appears in the divided list.

Jonson might fairly be regarded as an exceptional writer. Still, in view of this list, Professor Dover Wilson seems to be on rather dangerous ground when he seeks to draw a distinction between the practice of the two companies.

I said at the start that my intention was merely to submit facts, not to draw conclusions. But perhaps I may be allowed, without breach of that understanding, to add a hint as to the interpretation of the evidence. The data collected above point quite clearly to the fact that, as a general rule, the prompt-books of plays performed by children's companies at private theatres were divided into acts, and that the prompt-books of plays performed by men's companies at public theatres were not. I see no escape from this conclusion. But I think that the step from the form of the prompt-book to the conditions of performance, obvious as it seems at first sight, may very likely conceal pitfalls which do not appear on the surface.

THE LATER LIFE OF SAMUEL BUTLER

BY E. S. DE BEER

THE life of Samuel Butler has been a favourite field for conjecture, if not for deliberate misrepresentation; the object of the present article is to set forth the facts, so far as they can be established, of Butler's later career. For this it is necessary to go back to original documentary evidence, to Aubrey* and to the surviving collections of Butler's manuscripts.† The account of Butler given by Anthony à Wood‡ is mainly derived from Aubrey, but contains some interesting passages. The "Life" of Butler attached to the 1704 edition of *Hudibras*§ is in part derived from Wood; the writer had some

* *Brief Lives*, ed. Andrew Clark, 1898. The complete text is given nowhere else. The life of Butler (i. 135-8) is here referred to as "Aubrey"; where the page is given a notice of Butler occurs in the life of some other person.

† Portions have been printed: (1) By Dr. R. Thyer, *The Genuine Remains in Verse and Prose of Mr. Samuel Butler*, 2 vols., 1759. This contains various poems, the titles often supplied by the editor, and frequently apparently mere extracts from long passages; miscellaneous prose and a number of the "Characters." (2) By Dr. T. R. Nash, in the introduction and notes to his edition of *Hudibras*, 1793; Nash was Vicar of Strensham, Butler's birthplace, and collected biographical material (see also his *Collections for a History of Worcestershire*, 2 vols., 1781-2, Supplement 1799). (3) By Joseph Booker, *The Genuine Poetical Remains of Mr. Samuel Butler*, 1827. This reprints the verse in Thyer, with part of the prose, and also gives (pp. 260-88) "Various Readings of, and Additions to *Hudibras*." (4) By A. R. Waller, *Samuel Butler, Characters and Passages from Note-books*, 1908 (Cambridge English Classics). Some of the "Characters" had already appeared in Thyer; the remainder of the book is derived from the British Museum MSS.; the editing leaves much to be desired. Waller published an edition of *Hudibras* in the same series in 1905. Mr. R. B. Johnson published a revised edition of *The Poetical Works of Samuel Butler* in 1893; this includes all the verse printed by Thyer, but not Booker's additions; it gives also (ii. 297-305) two short passages from the British Museum MSS. and "Cydippe to Acontius" (see below). This edition contains a useful collection of biographical material in the introduction, referred to as "R. B. Johnson."

The British Museum Additional MSS. 32625 and 32626 have supplied almost all the material for the editors since Thyer and Nash; the former is in Butler's own hand; the latter consists of transcripts made, I believe, by Thyer. The history of the Butler MSS. is not too clear; Nash possessed material not now available, and the originals of many of Thyer's transcripts have disappeared. Professor R. Lamar informs me that he will shortly publish in the Cambridge English Classics a volume of miscellaneous verse and prose completing Butler's works.

‡ *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, 1813-20, iii. 874-6.

§ It occurs in some later editions also and is attributed by Oldys to Sir James Astrey, a Bedfordshire baronet of whom little is known (MS. note by Oldys in his copy of *Hudibras*, 1726, in the British Museum; R. B. Johnson, p. xxix).

knowledge of Butler's affairs, but cannot be regarded as trustworthy. The *Posthumous Works* of Samuel Butler * consist mainly of spurious items, among which must be included "Hudibras at Court"; they are of little value for Butler's biography, though some statements in the introductions might prove fruitful. In the *General Dictionary*, translating Bayle, 1734-1741, there is an article "Hudibras," † with notes contributed by Charles Longueville, son of William Longueville, the original owner of Butler's manuscripts; the notes, so far as they can be tested, are not trustworthy. Zachary Grey's edition of *Hudibras*, 1744, contains no matter of biographical value.

Before proceeding to Butler's later career, it is desirable to call attention to two articles dealing with his early life. The first, by Professor R. Lamar, ‡ casts much light on Butler's parentage; it is largely based on the wills and probate inventories of Butler's grandfather (1598) and father (1626), preserved in the Probate Registry at Worcester. These documents show them as well-to-do yeomen farmers; the grandfather's goods and farm stock being valued at £183 2s. 10d., the father's at £206 12s. 6d. The father leased some lands at Defford § and owned some land, part of which was left to Samuel, at Barbourne, near Worcester. In his will he mentioned three servants, two men and a woman. His books were valued at £6; those in Latin and Greek, with his dictionaries, he left to Samuel; those in English to his elder son Thomas. The opening passage in his will suggests that he had Puritan leanings; his patron and landlord, Sir William Russell, was an ardent Royalist in the Civil War.||

The second article, ¶ by pursuing Aubrey's source for his statement that Butler was at school at Worcester, shows, so far as the fact can be established in the absence of official documents, that Butler was educated at King's School, Worcester; the Mr. Hill who gave Aubrey the information was the Rev. Richard Hill, who is identified with the Richard elected to a King's scholarship in November 1626.

* Three vols., 1715, 1715, 1717; they were frequently reprinted before the *Genuine Remains* were published.

† Vol. vi. pp. 289-99.

‡ *Revue Anglo-Américaine*, i. (1924) 213-27.

§ See also Nash, *Hudibras*, Introd., p. i.

|| Victoria County History, *Worcestershire*, iv. 205.

¶ *The Vigornian*, November 1921. Signed "C.V.H." I am indebted to Mr. H. E. Nicholls, Clerk to the Governors of King's School, Worcester, for a copy of it.

After the Restoration, Butler was appointed Steward of Ludlow Castle for Richard Vaughan, Earl of Carbery, then Lord President of Wales; according to extracts from Carbery's accounts, published by Peter Cunningham, Butler held the position from January 1661 until January 1662, and was then superseded.* Butler's further connection with Carbery is unknown; on September 30, 1667, Carbery gave Butler a protection from arrest, but Butler may have been only nominally in his service.† In 1668, as will appear, Butler was in London.

On November 11, 1662, the first part of *Hudibras* was licensed, ‡ and was entered at Stationers' Hall by the publisher, Richard Marriott.§ Pepys purchased a copy on December 26 and another copy on February 6, 1662/3.|| Marriott produced perhaps four separate issues of Part I, all dated 1663. But before the end of 1662 the book had been pirated, and early in January 1662/3 advertisements appeared in *The Kingdom's Intelligencer* ¶ and in *Mercurius Publicus* ** warning readers against an unauthorised issue. There appear to have been four unauthorised issues (*i.e.* not bearing Marriott's name on the title-page); there is no satisfactory bibliography of the 1663 issues of Part I, even variant readings in one of Marriott's issues having passed unnoticed.

In addition to the pirated issues of Part I a spurious Second Part of *Hudibras* was published. Katherine Philips, at the time living in Dublin, mentions it in a letter dated June 3, 1663.†† There appear to be five separate issues or editions; again, there is no satisfactory bibliography. The work is a satirical attack on Sir William B—ton, apparently Brereton; ‡‡ nothing is known of the author.

The genuine Second Part of *Hudibras* was licensed on November 5, 1663, and entered on the same day at Stationers' Hall by John Martyn and James Allestry.§§ There are two issues, both

* *Notes and Queries*, 1st Ser., v. 5. The dates are New Style—S. Johnson, *Lives of the Poets*, ed. P. Cunningham, 1854, i. 173 n. The accounts are not now traceable. Aubrey mentions the stewardship.

† The protection is now in the possession of Hugh H. L. Bellot, Esq., D.C.L., a descendant from Dr. Thyer's step-daughter, Bessie Leigh.

‡ *Imprimatur* in the volume.

§ *Transcript of Registers* (Roxburghe Club), i. 319.

|| *Diary*. Sir Daniel Fleming paid 2s. 6d. for the postage of *Hudibras* on Feb. 13, 1662/3 (*Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Rep. XII, App. VII, p. 373).

¶ No. 1 for 1663, Dec. 29, 1662 to Jan. 5, 1662/3 (see *Notes and Queries*, 11th Ser., ii. 142).

** No. 1, January 1-8, 1662/3, p. 8.

†† *Letters from Orinda to Poliarchus*, 1705, p. 158.

‡‡ For whom see *D.N.B.*

§§ *Transcript of Registers*, i. 332.

dated 1664; but Pepys borrowed a copy on November 28, 1663.* The poem was advertised in *The Intelligencer* on November 30, 1663.† There are no unauthorised issues; on November 23 or 24, Butler received a licence giving him sole rights of reprinting *Hudibras* or of printing any new parts.‡

Butler now appears to have spent some time writing for the stage. In an anonymous *Session of the Poets*, dating from about 1665, there is a verse:

Then *Hudibras* boldly demanded the Bays,
But *Apollo* bad him not be so fierce;
And advis'd him to lay aside making his Plays,
Since he already began to write worse and worse.§

Dr. T. R. Nash records, in one of Butler's manuscripts in his possession, part of an unfinished tragedy called "Nero." || Aubrey states that Butler was a friend of D'Avenant.¶ Among the poems printed by Thyer are a Prologue and Epilogue to Habington's *Queen of Aragon*, acted before the Duke of York on his birthday. A performance on the Duke's birthday in 1668 (October 14) has been recorded,** and it was presumably for that occasion that Butler wrote the poems. Butler was certainly in London on July 19, 1668, when his friend Samuel Cooper, the miniaturist, took him to dine with Pepys.†† Ladies were present at the party, but Pepys, who knew Butler very slightly, does not mention any Mrs. Butler.‡‡

To the period between 1667 and 1680 belongs almost all Butler's certain work, so far as it can be dated, apart from the first two parts of *Hudibras* and *Lord Roos his Answer to the Marquess of Dorchester's Letter*.§§ According to Thyer the "Characters" were drawn up mainly between 1667 and 1669; |||| the dates of two have survived,

* *Diary*; see also 10 Dec. Katherine Philips received a copy in Dublin by 24 Dec.—*Letters*, *ut supra*, p. 208.

† No. 14, p. 109.

‡ *Cal. State Papers, Ireland*, 1663–1665, p. 298 (dated Nov. 23); *Cal. State Papers, Domestic*, 1663–1664, p. 350 (dated Nov. 24); draft, in Sir Joseph Williamson's hand, but with later and misleading heading, *Cal. State Papers, Domestic*, 1677–1678, p. 543.

§ *Poems on Affairs of State*, vol. i. 3rd ed., 1699, pt. i. p. 210. The poem is printed in other collections also.

|| Introduction to *Hudibras*, 1793, pp. xvi, xviii.

¶ *Brief Lives*, i. 204.

** *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Rep. XII, App. vii, p. 59 (from a news-letter).

†† *Diary*.

‡‡ Aubrey's statement establishes the marriage; I have not succeeded in tracing it.

§§ Printed c. March 19, 1660. For its authenticity, see Aubrey.

|||| Vol. ii, Preface, p. iv.

the "Bankrupt," October 6, 1667, and the "Horse-Courser," October 8, evidently of the same year.* Much of the surviving verse is related to the third part of *Hudibras*; Butler's method of composition was, roughly, to write long passages on detached themes; to save a few couplets from these for use in alternative treatments of the same theme, or in passages on other themes; and by process of distillation to collect enough material to be linked up into a canto. A few passages obviously related to Part III were printed by Booker in 1827.† Thyer's method of publication disguises the character of Butler's work.

The "Panegyric upon Sir John Denham's Recovery" belongs presumably to the period between January 1667 (Lady Denham's death) and March 1669 (Denham's own death); the reference to the embezzlement which took place during the Dutch War (l. 58) suggests a date later than autumn, 1667, when Parliament was concerned with it. A little later come the two poems dedicated to Edward Howard, whose *British Princes* was published early in 1669.‡ Another poem apparently belongs to this group, the so-called "Satirical Epistle to a Bad Poet." This is translated from Boileau's second Satire, which is addressed to Molière; Butler substitutes Howard for Boileau's Quinault.

Butler's connection with George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, is established by documentary evidence. Buckingham was elected Chancellor of the University of Cambridge on May 11, 1671, and held the office until July 11, 1674; Butler was acting as secretary to him in that capacity in June 1673, if not during the whole period.§ According to a casual notice in Wood, he gave some assistance to Buckingham in the composition of *The Rehearsall*.|| One poem may be associated with Buckingham's circle, the "Repatees between Cat and Puss"; there is nothing to determine its date, but it is natural to connect it with *The Conquest of Granada*, produced in December

* British Museum, Add. MS. 32625, ff. 235, 236.

† Booker (p. 260) printed six lines forming a variant of Part I, i. 115-8, a passage first printed in 1674; he has nothing else definitely related to Part I or II.

‡ The shorter poem was first printed as by Waller in Elijah Fenton's edition of Waller, 1729. It is rejected from Waller's works by Mr. G. Thorn Drury (Waller's *Poems*, 1893, Preface).

§ Aubrey; *Cal. State Papers, Domestic*, 1673, p. 395: application for a Cambridge fellowship promoted by Butler, not dated, but probably June 1673 (the document is at present exhibited in the Record Office Museum).

|| *Athenæ Oxon.*, ed. Bliss, iv. 209 (under Buckingham, not repeated under Butler). Contemporaries attribute the piece to only three authors—Buckingham, Clifford and Sprat.

1670 and January 1671. The date of Butler's "Character of a Duke of Bucks" is unknown; a personal acquaintance with Buckingham would not have been necessary for its composition.*

In 1671 Butler published his ode, *To the memory of the most renowned Du-Vall*; in 1672 he published *Two Letters* (John Audland and William Prynne). Both works are described on their title-pages as being written "By the Author of Hudibras."† In August 1674 appeared a new edition of Parts I and II of *Hudibras*.‡ It was published by John Martyn and Henry Herringman.§ It contains the "Heroical Epistle of Hudibras to Sidrophel," some notes, apparently written by Butler, and a number of alterations of the text; the poem was not re-handled as a whole. On November 30 of the same year Sir Stephen Fox was ordered to give Butler £200,|| probably from the Secret Service money.

In 1677 Butler was engaged in the publication of the Third Part of *Hudibras*. The book was entered at Stationers' Hall on August 22;¶ on September 10 Butler obtained a new injunction, signed by Charles II, giving him the sole rights of publication of *Hudibras*, or of any part of it.** The Third Part, dated 1678, was

* The fact that Butler was Buckingham's secretary renders the Pack-Wycherley story of Buckingham's abandoned patronage untenable. It first appears in the memoir by R. Pack attached to Wycherley's *Posthumous Works*, 1728, pp. 6, 7. The writer of the *Life* of 1704 was uncertain as to whether Buckingham had ever employed Butler, but believed that he had been a benefactor to him; he regarded Buckhurst (Dorset) as Butler's chief patron. The attacks on Edward Howard suggest a connection with Buckhurst; Prior, in a dedication to Buckhurst's son, says that Buckhurst first drew the Court's attention to *Hudibras* (M. Prior, *Poems on Several Occasions*, 1709, p. v).

Since writing this article my attention has been called to a statement in Professor V. de Sola Pinto's *Sir Charles Sedley*, p. 114, that Butler was one of the gentlemen attending Buckingham on his embassy to France in the summer of 1670. I have been unable to look up Mr. Pinto's references to the papers in the Archives étrangères. Of the other documents to which Mr. Pinto refers the letters in the State Papers, France (Public Record Office), alone mention a "Mr. Butler." Unless the papers in the Archives étrangères are more explicit the question of identification must remain open.

† *Two Letters* was published by Jonathan Edwin, *Du-Vall* by H. Brome, who had published in 1670 the *Memoirs of Du Val* attributed by Wood to Dr. Walter Pope. Wood doubted the authenticity of Butler's ode, but Thyer's discoveries in Butler's MSS. place it beyond question (Thyer, i. 145, 148).

‡ *London Gazette*, Nos. 909, 910, Aug. 3-6, Aug. 6-10, 1674.

§ The assignment by Marriott of his right in Part I to Herringman was entered in the Stationers' Register on July 27, 1669; the entry was made void by order of the Court, March 27, 1671 (*Transcript of Stationers' Register*, i. 404).

|| *Cal. Treasury Books*, 1672-1675, p. 267.

¶ *Transcript of Stationers' Register*, iii. 41; *Cal. State Papers, Domestic*, 1677-1678, p. 444.

** British Museum, Sloane MS. 4293, f. 7. Printed by R. B. Johnson, Introd., p. xxvi, and by other editors.

published by Simon Miller before November 6,* and had been read by the King before the end of the month.† On November 12 Butler was proposed for a pension on the Excise; on November 17 Charles ordered him to be given £100 and an annual pension of £100.‡ These gifts prove that Butler, in spite of the legend, was not completely neglected by Charles II; but they were not known to Aubrey or to other contemporaries, and Butler himself apparently contributed to the legend.§ No part of the pension appears to have been paid before September 25, 1678, when the King ordered a privy seal for quarterly payment, including arrears, to be given to Butler. ||

The satire "Upon Critics who judge of Modern Plays" belongs in all probability to this period, being an answer to Rymer's *Tragedies of the Last Age Considered*, which was published late in 1677.¶ Still later probably came the translation of "Cydippe, her epistle to Acontius," printed in *Ovid's Epistles translated by several hands*, and published in 1680. In the meantime new editions of *Hudibras* had appeared, Parts I and II together in 1678** and Part III in 1679.††

Butler, who is said to have occupied a room in Rose Alley, Covent Garden, at this period,‡‡ was confined to his room by gout from October 1679 until Easter 1680. He died "of a consumption" on September 25, 1680, and was buried on September 27 in the churchyard of St. Paul's, Covent Garden.§§ Among the friends who

* Hist. MSS. Comm., *Marquis of Bath MSS. at Longleat*, ii. 159. There are two issues of this part dated 1678.

† Hist. MSS. Comm., Rep. XII, App. V, p. 44.

‡ *Cal. Treasury Books*, 1676-1679, pp. 478, 479.

§ In his commonplace book Nash found the following couplet written out twice:

To think how Spencer died, how Cowley mourn'd,
How Butler's faith and service were return'd."

(*Hudibras*, 1793, I, x, facsimile, p. xxxix). This is a variant of a couplet in Otway's Prologue to Lee's *Constantine the Great*, performed about December 1683 and printed 1684. From Aubrey's remarks it would appear that Butler had expected some good post and had been disappointed. References to the gifts to Butler are to be found in the eighteenth century biographical dictionaries.

|| *Cal. Treasury Books*, 1676-1679, p. 1116.

¶ J. E. Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, ii. 341, 351. For the date of Rymer, E. Arber, *Term Catalogues*, i. 294. Another satire, "Upon Modern Critics," cannot be dated.

** *Term Catalogues*, i. 323 (June); published by Martyn and Herringman.

†† *Ibid.* i. 377 (Nov.); published by Robert Horne.

‡‡ Information supplied by W. Longueville, in the article in the *General Dictionary*.

§§ Aubrey; *Registers of St. Paul's, Covent Garden* (Harleian Society), iv. 89. Information about his monuments in St. Paul's, Covent Garden, and in Westminster Abbey is given by Mr. R. B. Johnson, p. xcvi.

attended his funeral were Aubrey, Tom Shadwell (apparently the dramatist), Sir Robert Thomas (M.P. for Cardiff from 1661-1680), Dr. Cole (probably Dr. William Cole, whose *Physico-Medical Essay*, 1689, is dated from Worcester), Dr. Davenant (probably Charles, the economist, son of Sir William) and Mr. Saunders, a relative of Butler's early patron, the Countess of Kent.* Other friends who had died before him were Thomas Hobbes,† Samuel Cooper, the miniaturist, and Sir William D'Avenant.‡ Butler is said to have been buried at the expense of William Longueville, who is known to have possessed his manuscripts in the early part of the eighteenth century.§

* Aubrey.

† Aubrey, i. 371. In a letter to Aubrey of August 18, 1679, Hobbes sends his services to Butler, i. 342, repeated p. 381.

‡ Aubrey, i. 204, and under Butler.

§ *Life of 1704*. Longueville is not mentioned by Aubrey. For the descent of the MSS. Thyer, I, Preface. John Clarke, who possessed them in 1754, was a natural son of Charles Longueville, not of Butler, as the letter from James Massey, printed by Nash (*Worcestershire*, Supplement, p. 71), might lead one to suppose.

CRABB ROBINSON'S OPINION OF SHELLEY

By R. W. KING

HENRY CRABB ROBINSON (1775-1867), barrister, man-about-town, and diarist, is remembered chiefly as the friend of such great men as Wordsworth, Coleridge, Lamb, and Goethe, all of whom knew little of Shelley and either ignored or grievously misjudged him both as man and as poet. But in Robinson's voluminous diary there are, scattered up and down, a good number of references which show that he was not, ultimately, content to take Shelley even at Wordsworth's valuation. Robinson, in fact, though a man of no great depth or subtlety of mind, always tried to think for himself; and by tracing the changes in his views on Shelley and his works as he passed from the prime of life to old age we may get an interesting glimpse of the development, during the period before Shelley's fame was securely established, of the average intelligent man's opinion.*

By 1817 Robinson, who like his idol Wordsworth had in his youth been a revolutionary and a disciple of William Godwin, had settled down to an emphatic though not bigoted conservatism; he still visited Godwin and retained some admiration for his powers, but "Perfectibilianism" no longer thrilled him, and the *Enquiry concerning Political Justice* slumbered unnoticed on his shelves. Still, it is not surprising that on his first meeting with Shelley (at Godwin's on November 6 of this year) the staid barrister felt a faint stirring of the old enthusiasm in listening to the young poet's shrill-voiced and fiery revolutionary talk. "His youth," he writes, "and a resemblance to Southey, particularly in his voice, raised a pleasing impression, which was not altogether destroyed by his conversation, which is vehement and arrogant and intolerant." Shelley abused

* Of the following extracts from the diary (which I have examined by permission of the Trustees of Dr. Williams's Library) only one or two have been printed, in Sadler's useful but very unreliable edition: *Diary, Reminiscences, and Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson* (1869, 3 vols.; third edition, 1872, 2 vols.).

both Southey and (though "with less bitterness") Wordsworth as sycophants and political renegades; but Robinson was not seriously offended. Probably he reminded himself, with a sigh, as he sat down that evening to his little notebook, that Shelley was twenty-five and himself forty-two; and on Southey he added the just comment: "On every topick but the last [*i.e.* the violence of his party feelings], the friends of Southey are under no difficulty in defending him."

Yet it was long before Robinson came to take Shelley seriously either as a political and philosophical theorist or as a poet. There is a passing reference in the diary for the next year to Shelley as "wrong-headed,"* but no sign for four years of his making any effort to acquaint himself with Shelley's writings. At last, on December 28, 1821, he records an unsuccessful attempt to read the *Prometheus Unbound* volume, which he had borrowed from Godwin:

In the evening reading at home—I began Shelley's *Prometheus*, which I could not get on with. I was quickened in my purpose of throwing it aside by the *Quarterly Review* [the attack on Shelley in the issue of October 1821], which exposes the want of meaning in his poems with considerable effect. It is good to be now and then withheld from reading bad books—Shelley's polemical hatred of Christianity is as unpoetical as it is irrational.

He quotes the rash lines on Christianity from the *Ode to Liberty* (stanza VIII) and concludes, it would seem, with a final farewell to Shelley's poetry:

This is miserable rant—and would be so were it as true as it is false. I shall send Shelley back to Godwin unread—G. himself is unable to read his works.

We hear nothing more until 1827, five years after Shelley's death, when we begin to find signs of a more sympathetic view of the poet's personality. In the interval Robinson had become better acquainted with Mary Shelley (of whose talents he became an admirer), Horace Smith, and other friends of Shelley. Even Wordsworth, moreover, was revising his judgment a little, as the entry for December 20, 1827, shows:

Began this evening to look into Shelley's poems. . . . Fancy seems

* April 25, 1818; he notes a meeting with Longdill, Shelley's solicitor, and after remarking "He does not speak with much regard of Shelley tho' he gives a favorable account of him," he adds: "But Sh: is wrong-headed at least—of this no other proof is necessary than that he has made Lord Byron his Executor." Poor Shelley! he suffered much for his loyalty to Byron.

to be his best quality—he is rich and exuberant. When he endeavours to turn the abstractions of metaphysics into poetry he probably fails—as who does not? but even in his worst works I have no doubt there is the enthusiasm of virtue and benevolence. I think him worth studying and understanding if possible—I recollect Wordsworth places him above Lord Byron.

Another potent influence was the fuller knowledge of Shelley's life and character gained from Leigh Hunt's *Lord Byron and some of his Contemporaries*, which Robinson read on its appearance in 1828:

(Feb. 5, 1828.) Finished Hunt's *Lord Byron*. This book contains an able apology for the opinions and character of Shelley—his supposed atheism seems to be the result of an excessive sensibility to the wrongs committed by the great and powerful who are the noisy assertors of the doctrines of religion, and an excessive refinement of thought. The extracts from his poems are delightful.

A month later, on March 2, he read the second act of *Prometheus Unbound*, and notes that it "raised my opinion very much of Shelley as a poet." Robinson adds, with much justice, that "no man had ever more natural piety than he," and that "his supposed Atheism is a mere metaphysical crotchet, in which he was kept by the affected scorn and real malignity of dunces." Yet on March 31, when he finished *Prometheus*, he pronounced it "an utterly unintelligible rhapsody," though he thought that "all the smaller poems of the same volume are delightful." His view of Shelley at this period is summed up in a passing reference in a reverential letter to Goethe, dated January 31, 1829: *

I perceive, from your *Kunst und Alterthum*, that you are not altogether regardless of the progress which your works are making in foreign countries. Yet I do not find any notice of the splendid fragments from *Faust* by Shelley, Lord Byron's friend, a man of unquestionable genius, the perverse misdirection of whose powers and early death are alike lamentable.

Three years later we find the diarist's opinion of Shelley's poetry substantially unchanged. In 1832 he borrowed from Horace Smith the *Posthumous Poems* which Mary Shelley had edited in 1824:

The small poems of Shelley [he writes, September 5, 1832] appear to me as beautiful as ever, but he is too fond of dreaming—he might have approached to Tieck. His translation of the Hymn to Mercury from Homer is very curious—I can hardly think it to be a translation. It is very like Goethe.

* Printed by Sadler (1872), vol. ii, pp. 53-54.

But *The Cenci*, which he also began to read at this time, made a mixed impression. He read the first act "without pleasure," and on finishing the play (September 9), though admitting that there is "a sort of fascination in it," he remarks :

Yet it had better not have been written. It only fills the imagination with frightful monsters. Cenci is not a human being—he is a dæmon—and no intimation how he became so.

It was not until after his sixtieth year that Robinson's view of Shelley's character and opinions assumed its final form—substantially that of the intelligent reader of to-day—and he became capable of appreciating the longer poems. He began, curiously enough, with a reconsideration of *Queen Mab*, both text and notes of which Shelley had before his death come to repudiate as crude and juvenile. On January 10, 1836, Robinson writes :

I read at night and in the morning the notes to Shelley's *Queen Mab* as well as here and there bits of his poetry. His atheism is very repulsive, but the God he denies seems to be after all but the God of the superstitious. I suspect that he has been guilty of this fault, of which I find I have all my life been guilty, tho' not to his extent—inferring that there can be no truth behind the palpable falsehoods propounded to him. He draws in one of his notes [to Section VII, lines 135-6] a picture of Christianity, or rather he sums up the Christian doctrine, and in such a way that perhaps W[ordsworth] would say—"This I disbelieve as much as Shelley, but that is only the caricature and burlesque of Christianity,"* and yet this is the Christianity most men believe. As poetry there is much very delightful in Shelley.

We may insert here, a little out of chronological order, an entry of July 28, 1841, in which *Queen Mab* and its "atheism" are again discussed :

In the forenoon I strolled in the fields . . . reading *Queen Mab* in which I found a number of splendid passages. I have no doubt that even his atheism proceeded from ill directed and perversely applied virtuous emotions—a partial sense of the follies and crimes perpetrated in the name of God and Religion has made him zealous to extirpate what he honestly thought in his youth to be pernicious error. But in his own notions was also error both flagrant and pernicious.

On August 26, 1839, the diarist notes—commencing with his usual phrase for desultory reading in a favourite author : "I lounged

* Sadler prints the bulk of this entry ; but he was a minister—though a Unitarian—and rather significantly he omits the next sentence.

for a long time over Shelley's poems—enjoyed the Witch of Atlas tho' I could make neither head nor tail of it—such is the power of poetry—sheer poetry." We may, I think, regard Robinson as having graduated as a sympathetic admirer of Shelley when he writes thus of what Swinburne was to characterise as "one of the most splendid existing poems of pure fancy and visionary rapture." Accordingly, when in 1840 Mary Shelley edited her husband's prose writings in the *Essays, Letters from Abroad, Translations and Fragments*, we soon find Robinson reading the two volumes with keen interest. He spent some time over them (the entries covering from December 30, 1840 to January 13, 1841) during one of his numerous Christmas visits to Wordsworth at Rydal. Though he did not care for the translations from Plato (he knew little of Greek literature), he thought Shelley "master of an admirable prose style," and mentions with particular praise "several beautiful fragments of poetic prose—a fantastic scene at the Colosseum [*i.e.*, *The Coliseum*] and an eloquent fragment of a tale of the Assassins." It is a little surprising, perhaps, that he should have found these more striking than the *Defence of Poetry*, which he does not mention; but he reserves his highest praise, as we might expect, for the letters from Italy:

I have been delighted with Shelley's Letters from Italy. . . . His taste is most delicate, and altogether there is a captivating moral sentiment throughout. His contempt for Christianity is strongly expressed and is a stain on the book, but even that I believe was a very honest mistake.

We may close this disconnected series of glimpses into one corner of the diarist's mind with a slightly ampler extract giving, in 1845, his revised impression of *The Cenci*. Its discriminating praise stands in striking contrast to the left-handed compliments of a dozen years before:

(March 22, 1845.) I came home between 10 and 11 and then I took up Shelley's Poems and set about the Cenci of which I read two acts in bed. (March 23) I continued the tragedy in bed and have now finished. I have read it with great delight—I find but one fault in it. There is no motive suggested for the unparalleled atrocity of Cenci the father. Shakespear has never given a villain without enabling us to see why he is a villain; or if not, he lets us see that he is not a mere monster. All his worst characters have something human about them and some redeeming quality. Now Cenci has none. It is absolutely against nature that a father should so hate his children. It is more hate than lust that leads him to violate Beatrice. But then on the other hand how exquisite is

that Beatrice—she is as perfect as he is monstrous. All is well conceived and the tragedy is a perfect whole, and leaves the just feeling of repose after the conflict of guilt. In Beatrice's submission to death is the tragic purification. At first I objected to her wilful denial of the truth, but her motive is the allowable infirmity of noble minds—to save the family honour she lied to the last. I was led for the sake of comparison to read Coleridge's "Remorse," which I thought beautiful and with some very fine passages, but in significance far beneath the Cenci.

A good many years were still to pass before Shelley's name could be publicly mentioned, without fear of ridicule, in the same breath with those of Wordsworth and Coleridge and Byron. Dowden's *Life*, and Buxton Forman's Library Edition, and the queer, ironic Shelley Memorial in University College, Oxford, were yet to come. But I think Shelley, in "the abode where the Eternal are," must have smiled with genuine pleasure to find that the affable, loquacious barrister who had disagreed with his politics in 1817 did in the long run learn to estimate both his character and his poetry at something like their true worth.

SEARCHING LOCAL RECORDS

BY DOROTHY M. MEADS

It is often something of an adventure, this searching for a much-desired bit of information, concealed somewhere in one or other of England's numerous repositories scattered throughout the land. Sometimes the search is easy; frequently it is very difficult, and occasionally fruitless. The quest may take us to all manner of places, a garret perhaps, maybe an outhouse or a cathedral tower, very likely a bank or a lawyer's office. And here, even now, we meet frequently with the dust of ages, with damp, the ravages of fire and vermin, with mouldering decay and chaos. Truly there is often, though by no means always, all the spice of unreality about this search, incredible though it may appear in post-war England, and the purpose of these notes is to indicate the quality and variety of some of the treasure-trove which still exists, and to help to locate it as quickly as possible.

Our chief guide here is Dr. Hall's indispensable *Repertory of British Archives, Part I, England* (1920). Constant reference has been made to it for the purpose of this article, and all students in this field of research will find it immensely useful.

In 1920, Dr. Hall wrote thus :

Although . . . the activities or interests of the towns, parishes, ecclesiastical bodies and individual citizens of this country may be traced back for more than eight hundred years in a large mass of local records, those collections are now in most cases exceedingly imperfect, while the official records in the custody of the county councils and statutory authorities or trusts are in still worse plight. . . . Many collections of ancient muniments have been pillaged with impunity by local antiquaries, and a still larger proportion of later papers has been wilfully destroyed or allowed to perish from neglect. . . . The custody of county, town, and parish records has been precarious from the first, and has depended largely on the personality of their custodians. . . . The ecclesiastical records have had the great advantage of being preserved in repositories which were usually situated in the church itself; but, on the other hand, they have

suffered from the great spoliation of the Reformation period, and the higher clergy, as a body, have taken little interest in their preservation down to recent times. The Registers have been relatively better preserved than any other parochial records, because their safety has been an object of solicitude to the clergy and laity at large. In contrast to this survival, churchwardens' accounts, which contain still more interesting materials for parochial history, have mostly perished with rate-books, and other early records, in the custody of parish officers." *

Something, however, has been done, since Dr. Hall wrote, by Record, and other Societies, and by the authorities of diocese, county and borough, to repair the ravages of neglect and make their treasures more accessible to the student.

To appreciate the wealth of local records, of which there still exists an enormous mass, reaching in time far back into the Middle Ages, something of the distribution, custody, and administration of local collections must first be known. To those who would join in the hunt we recommend, first, a familiarity with the reports and appendices (all well indexed) of certain Government Committees and Commissions appointed to inspect Public Records. These are :

1. The Report of the Select Committee on the Public Records of the Kingdom, appointed by the House of Commons, 1800.
2. The Reports of the Royal Commission on Municipal Corporations, 1835.
3. The last General Report of the Royal Commission on Public Records, 1837.†
4. The Report of the Committee on Local Records, 1902.
5. The Second Report of the Royal Commission on Public Records, Pts. I-III, 1914.
6. The Third Report of the Royal Commission on Public Records, Pts. I-III, 1919.

Those most essential to the earnest searcher are numbers 4 and 6, which are the main guides to the contents of individual local repositories, and to the whereabouts of our local records, their custody and preservation. Other guides there are—they will be mentioned later—which in many necessary respects supplement the above.

It is proposed to deal, in most detail, with five types of local records. There are others : Dr. Hall in his *Repertory* classifies local archives into seven, and the 1919 Report, by combining two of Dr. Hall's classes, into six. These last will be only briefly noted. Local records may be classified from several different points of view, but,

* Hall, H., *A Repertory of British Archives* (1920), pp. xxvii, xxviii.

† P.P. 1837, vol. xxxiv. Pts. I and II.

whatever plan be adopted, there will be cross-divisions, and lines between different classes will be difficult to draw. The simplest and most helpful division, at present, from the researcher's point of view, will be to survey local records mainly by reference to their repository and subject-matter, indicating, by detailed description, the often heterogeneous contents of any one class of repository. Until the material in each be arranged and adequately catalogued, as comparatively little of it is to-day, it is impossible to make a definite and permanent classification of local records.

County Records.

These contain documents of great historical value, and of very considerable bulk ; *e.g.* the Worcestershire records from 1591-1643 contain 5870 documents. The records of seven or eight English counties begin in the sixteenth century, five or six have none earlier than the eighteenth, and the rest begin some time in the seventeenth century. "Parish, hundred, township, and seignorial franchise" have all contributed to the existing county archives, which include records relating to the offices of Lord-Lieutenant, and *Custos Rotulorum*, and to the proceedings of the County Justices in Quarter Sessions from the sixteenth century, the whole known as Quarter Sessions records. With one exception, none are known to exist before 1547. These are, or should be, in the custody of the Clerk of the Peace, who, by the Local Government Act of 1888, is also Clerk of the County Council. The administrative records of the modern county councils begin in that year, and are also in the charge of the Clerk.

The origin of the Justice of the Peace has been traced back at least to the beginning of Edward I's reign. The proceedings of the Justices were regulated by various statutes up to 1545, when the constitution of Quarter Sessions was revised. The justices also functioned "out of sessions," that is, in Petty and Special Sessions. In the former, they tried minor offences without a jury ; in the latter, they licensed alehouses, etc. This jurisdiction was not properly regulated before the eighteenth century, but it dates back to Tudor times and must have produced many records. All the early ones, however, seem to have disappeared, a calamity which Dr. Hall, and the 1919 Report, attribute to the fact of their having been allowed often to remain in the custody of some practising solicitor who acted as clerk to the magistrates ; thus the records have been lost to sight

for a long time and have finally disappeared.* The records of Petty Sessions are still to-day left in the custody of the magistrates' clerk, nor is there any security that they will be preserved. As early as the fourteenth century, it was seemingly the duty of the Justices' Clerk to keep the records, and the Justices were supposed to see this work carried out. But evidently, even if made, the records were not adequately preserved, because under Henry VIII began the appointment of a *Custos Rotulorum* by the Crown, his title being derived from his office, that of keeping, even if only nominally, the rolls or records of the Sessions of the Peace, and of the Commissioners of the Peace.

This civil office is usually held by a person who also holds the military office of Lieutenant, more commonly called Lord-Lieutenant, the Clerk of the Peace having the custody of the documents relating to both offices, subject to the directions of the *Custos Rotulorum*.

The records divide easily, in character, into two main classes, judicial and administrative, though this division excludes certain types of records. The information about them, given in the Reports cited above, proves abundantly that various types are to be found in every county, while the inspections of, and returns to, the Commissioners, make equally apparent what a very large amount of Quarter Sessions records, filed since 1545, have perished through the neglect of their custodians.† To-day they are usually arranged into two main series: (1) the older records in the custody of the Clerk of the Peace, and (2) the records of the County Council, dating from 1888, in the custody, usually, of the same official, in his other capacity as Clerk to the County Council.

It is with that first series, of inestimable value historically, that we are chiefly concerned. Most important in all collections are the Sessions Records. "The usual form of these is that of a year-file of original records wrapped in a parchment cover, so as to resemble a roll or bundle." They comprise Writs, Indictments, Presentments, Convictions, Informations, Depositions, Examinations, Bonds or Recognisances, Inquisitions (Coroners'), Orders

* Hall, H., *op. cit.*, p. 111.

† The best general account of the older portions of the county records, in the keeping of the several Clerks of the Peace (and each dealt with separately), is to be found in the 1902 Report, especially p. 8, and App. XI, and in Dr. Hall's *Reper-tory*, pp. 112-114, as also in the accounts of particular collections reported on by the Historical MSS. Commission. For these last, see the 19th Report (1925) of the Commission, which contains an index to all the records reported on up to that date.

and Certificates, Jury Panels, Names of Ministers, Estreats of Fines, and Proceedings in Appeal Cases.

Next in importance are the Sessions books, which are the entry books of the orders and decisions of the justices, some of which are not found in the Sessions file. With these are entered also many administrative orders, precepts and certificates, etc.*

Besides these there are, also entered in books, registers or inolments of documents deposited in the custody of the Clerk of the Peace, either according to statute (a modern development this) or custom, or the originals themselves may be filed in bundles. There are, too, very many miscellaneous documents concerning the multifarious activities of Quarter Sessions in their administrative aspect, for it must be remembered that, in the administration of the laws, the J.P.'s were the Tudor "maids of all work."

The matter here contained illumines every aspect of the history of the people, political, constitutional, ecclesiastical, economic, social and purely local, for the Court of Quarter Sessions had diverse functions, which gave contact with every side of national life. The nature of the crimes and offences brought before the Justices of the Peace, and their frequency, are an adequate comment on the moral standards of period and place. The details noted in the depositions illustrate the life of every class. Amongst the oldest of the records in the custody of the Clerk of the Peace are the inolments of conveyances by bargain and sale, in accordance with the Act, 27 Hen. VIII, c. 16, (1536). In the eighteenth century, there are registers of the oaths of Roman Catholics, and inolments of conveyances and deeds relating to them. The "deputations" of gamekeepers begin in Anne's reign, and give the names of the lords of the manors at various dates. The enclosure rolls, together with the maps and plans concerned, date also from the eighteenth century. A later series, of great topographical value, comprises the plans of proposed canals, railways, and other modern enterprises. The jurisdiction of Quarter Sessions also contemplated the older methods of communication and transport: the maintenance of bridges was their special charge. Some *Bridge Books*, i.e. those of Essex, begin in Elizabeth's reign. The supervision of highways was another function of the justices, while in the reign of William III they were called upon to fix the rates of land-carriage, and, under

* Hall, H., *op. cit.*, p. 116.

George III, to register the barges and boats employed in water-transport.

Amongst the many subjects found amongst the records are the assessments made for county rates, the returns compiled for the purpose of hearth and land taxes, the accounts and vouchers for the expenditure of the county, statistics of corn prices, certificates of the amount of hemp and flax grown, and registers of cotton and other factories, all kept by the Clerk of the Peace.

A mass of documents relates to the administration of the Poor Law, but the best known economic documents are the wages assessments, made by the Justices in Quarter Sessions, from the time of Elizabeth onwards.

It was also the machinery of Quarter Sessions which was first used "to enforce religious conformity, and afterwards to regulate toleration." Throughout the seventeenth century, Roman Catholic recusants were prosecuted in Quarter Sessions for non-attendance at church, and, in the eighteenth century, particulars of their estates were registered there, and their wills, etc., enrolled. The oaths required by the Test Act were sworn, and recorded, at Quarter Sessions, and the "Sacramental Certificates," which bore witness to conformity, were there produced and registered. It was the duty of the justices to prosecute Nonconformists for attending conventicles, and to hear, at the sessions, the declarations and oaths required from Dissenters after the Toleration Act came into force. The same authority, too, registered and licensed places of worship, both of Nonconformists and Roman Catholics.*

The records of county jurisdiction and administration may be summarily listed, according to subject, into the following classes :

- Commissions of the Peace.
- Oaths and rolls of the Justices of the Peace.
- Appointments and lists of county officers.
- Lists of persons qualified to serve as jurors.
- Grand Jury presentments.
- Papers relating to the proceedings of Quarter Sessions.
- Papers relating to gaols, prisoners, and vagrants.
- Presentments, certificates and other documents relating to highways and bridges.
- Papers relating to the granting of licences for alehouses, for theatrical representations, for drovers.
- Rates of wages, of carriage of goods, etc.

* 1919 Report, Part I, pp. 9-11.

Accounts and assessments.

Registers of certificates for the use of hair powder, for killing game, and of gamekeepers' deputations.

Statistical returns.

Oaths of allegiance.

Certificates, etc., with regard to places of worship, societies and charities.

Inrolments of private deeds, inclosure awards, and other documents relating to land.

Lists of Parliamentary voters and accounts of election expenses.

Lieutenancy papers.*

Two officers of the county have the custody of their own records: the Sheriff and the Coroner. The ancient connection of the former with the Exchequer came to an end with the judicial reforms of 1833-4, and now the Sheriff's records are only formal documents, kept by the under-sheriff. The records of the Coroners' Courts are more important, and of great antiquity. By an act as early as 4 Edward I, the coroners were ordered to take cognisance of cases of treasure trove, wreck of sea, and other matters, as well as of cases of sudden and violent death. The Public Record Office houses a large collection of early Coroners' Rolls,† for from time to time accounts of their proceedings were returned to the justices itinerant. Inquisitions of a later date, which led to actions, may be found also among the indictments of the Court of King's Bench in the Record Office, as well as among the records of the various Clerks of the Peace, whose duty it was to file copies of the inquisitions, etc., in criminal causes.

The records of the Borough Quarter Sessions, held in all the more important towns, are not of course in the custody of the county Clerk of the Peace, and the records of the ancient palatinates have mostly been transferred now to the Public Record Office.

It is obvious, from this brief and by no means exhaustive survey, that when county records are well preserved, and made easy of access by calendaring or even by adequate arrangement, their yield of information about the past is such that no other sources can compare with them. Moreover, the knowledge they give is not merely of a

* 1902 Report, p. 8. Dr. Hall classifies the records structurally, *i.e.* according to form, and in far more detail, in *A Repertory*, pp. 115, 116. See also, for most interesting descriptions of the contents of Quarter Sessions records, the introductions to *Lancashire Quarter Sessions*, edited by J. Tait (*Chetham Society, N.S.* vol. 77, 1917) and *Worcestershire County Records. Calendar of the Quarter Sessions Papers*, vol. i, compiled by J. W. Willis Bund (1900).

† See Giuseppe, *Guide to the Public Record Office*; and *Select Cases from the Coroners' Rolls, A.D. 1265-1413*, edited for the Selden Society by Dr. C. Gross.

locality but of a nation. Once those records are dispersed by wanton or accidental destruction, sale or theft, they can never be replaced.

Emphasis must be laid on the fact that, so far as the contents of the records of our counties are known, they show large gaps in the chronological series, and few contain something of all the possible subjects detailed above. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that, even when documents are known to exist, they are not necessarily where they ought to be. Those of Middlesex are by far the most complete. Extracts from these sessions rolls in the sixteenth century may serve to illustrate in part the type of material found in the records at this period.

19 Aug. 4 Edw. VI.

Coroner's Inquisition-post-mortem, taken at Strond co. Midd. on view of the body of William Wreyke late of Islyngton labourer, there lying dead: With Verdict that on the 18th of July past the said William Wreyke was at his dwelling-place at Islyngton in God's and the King's peace, when Elizabeth Wreyke late of Islyngton spynster came in upon him and assaulted him with intention of murdering him, and with her hands seized his neck, and strangled and broke his neck, so that he then and there died instantly.*

2 November, 1 Mary.

True Bill that, John Lyn senr. yoman, John Lyn junr. yoman, Brigetta Carden gentilwoman, Roger Skyers servingman, Richard Pygg servingman, John Ebb husbondman, Edward Boocher husbondman, George Sheperd husbondman, John Taylour husbondman, John Yomans waterman, with unknown persons to the number of sixteen, arrayed and armed in warlike manner, assembled riotously on the same day, and made unlawful and violent entry into the close and house, called the Mener House of Popler, belonging to John Maynerd of London mercer, and then and there assaulted, beat and wounded John Maynerd aforesaid, his wife Elianora, Thomas Ivey, Thomas Sharp, William Ryddall and Thomas Oxeman. †

25 July, 44 Elizabeth.

Recognizances, taken before Chidioc Wardoure and William Harrison esqrs. J.P., of Phillip Lacon of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields gentleman, in the sum of twenty pounds, John Carter of Lambeth Marsh co. Surrey yeoman, and Richard Quarington of Edgeworth co. Midd. wheelwright, in the sum of ten pounds each; For the appearance of Anne, wife of the said Phillip Lacon, at the next General Session of the Peace, she having

* *Middlesex County Records*, vol. I. *Indictments, Coroners' Inquests-Post-Mortem, and Recognizances from 3 Edward VI. to the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth*. Edited by J. C. Jeaffreson [1886], p. 4.

† *Ibid.* p. 16.

been "taken at Hamersmith wearing of man's apparel and for the same committed to the Gaole of Newgate." *

The Somerset Quarter Sessions records illustrate well the administrative side of that organisation.

Sessions of the Peace held at Bridgwater, 30 September, 1 & 2 October, 21 James I. [1623].

Upon the petition of Christopher Haddon of Wellington that Francis [Francis] Hill, his apprentice, doth little or no service, but doth remain away and wander about the country, and being brought home doth run away again, and her mother, Francis Hill, doth affirm that if her daughter be sent to the House of Correction she will hang herself, and the said maid also saith that she will hang or drown herself rather than live with the said Haddon: Referred to William Francis and Edward Lancaster, esquires, who are desired to take some pains in the examination of the premises, and to certify their opinions at the next Sessions.

Upon the humble petition of Mary, wife of William Wootton of Curland, that they with their family have lived one whole year and upwards at Curland without any charging the parish; yet now the parishioners, fearing that they will become chargeable, the said Wootton having become impotent by reason of age and sickness, have put them forth of their house, and, in most unchristianlike manner, suffer them to dwell under a hedge: Ordered that the churchwardens and overseers shall receive them into the parish until they shall show good cause to the contrary at a General Quarter Sessions in the presence of the said Wootton or his wife.

At Wells session cause was shown that they ought not to dwell at Curland ideo hic ordo vacat.

The petition of Richard Averie of Enmer [Enmore] husbandman, stating that about the first year of the King's reign that now is [James I] your poor Suppliant being a poor man then did for his better ease give and bestow freely unto one Robert Shurvye of Wellington, etc., weaver, the sum of £3 with the placing of your said Suppliant's daughter to be the said Shurvye's apprentice for nine years during all which term the said Robert Shurvy was to keep your said Suppliant's daughter in good and reasonable manner as an apprentice ought to be and accordingly the said Shurvy did keep and maintain your said Suppliant's daughter about four years and three-quarters of a year until that by the evil usage of the said Shurvy's wife made your said Suppliant's daughter lame and impotent in her feet. And then the said Shurvye not this contented did the 25th day of January last past, etc., procured and sent home unto your poor Suppliant his said daughter lame in a barrow, and from tithing to tithing, since which time your poor Suppliant more than his ability is able hath bestowed and paid for and towards the healing of his daughter about five pounds, and as yet the said Shervye doth most wrongfully detain and keep

* *Ibid.* p. 284.

from your said Suppliant the said £3 given him as aforesaid in consideration whereof your poor Suppliant most humbly beseecheth your good Worships to take such Order herein as your good Worships shall think fit, etc.

Sessions of the Peace held at Wells, 9, 10, 11 & 12 January, 18 James I.

On a petition of Richard Frye of Street, that he is a very poor man with a great charge of six small children, which are fit to be bound apprentice according to the orders heretofore taken by the Judges of Assize and Justices of Peace; yet they are still remaining on his hands, and he can get no relief of the parish: Desired that the two next Justices of the Peace shall call Frye and the overseers and such others of the said parish as they shall think fit before them; and to settle and bind forth such of the said children and take such further order herein as they shall think fit.

Sessions held at Wells, 9, 10, 11, 12 days of January, 13 James I.

On a petition from the inhabitants of Salford that they have many poor that want houses, and two poor widows, the one having six small children and the other five, who do want houses: Ordered that the house already built for the relief of the poor within the said parish shall be enlarged and built bigger, according to the discretion of the overseers and other the parishioners, and that they do make an equal rate for the same upon the inhabitants according to their abilities and estates.

Sessions Rolls, Somerset, 1608.

Whereas the Court hath been this day informed that by means of digging lead oare upon the fforest of Mendip the King's highway there in divers places is become very foundorous and exceeding dangerous for His Majesty's liege people in passing that way, it is therefore at this Sessions ordered that none shall henceforth dig or make any mines [moyns] in the said highway upon pain that may ensue, etc.*

It is only recently that attention has been drawn to the masses of valuable historical material in county repositories, one reason being, as was lately said of the archives of parishes and boroughs as well as of counties that they were "still, for the most part, not only unprinted, but also uncalendared, and indeed, in the majority of places, not even registered or publicly recorded as existing."† Yet the Reports of 1902 and 1919 made public the condition of these records in many places, and the losses to the country, suffered in the past, by every sort of mischance proceeding from careless and

* Somerset Record Society, vol. xxiii, *Quarter Sessions Records for the County of Somerset*, vol. i, ed. E. H. Bates (1907), pp. 336-7, pp. 23-4, p. 283, p. 164, p. 12.

† Webb, S. and B., *English Local Government: English Poor Law History*, Part I, p. vi (1927). Much has been done by this excellent series to awaken interest in local records, upon which it is largely based.

ignorant custodians. Recommendations, too, concerning all classes of local records were put forward in the Reports; their better care and arrangement, and greater ease of access by means of calendars, or at least indexes, was strongly advised. But our modern complaint is three hundred years old, for William Lambard wrote thus of the Custos Rotulorum in his *Eirenarcha*:

As this man is (by name and office) Keeper of the Records of the People, so would it not a little amend the service if hee were (in deed also) carefull for the due preservation of them, and would not loosely leave them (as commonly it is found) to the onely custodie of the Clarke of the Peace, without having any register of their number and sorts, and without appointing any convenient place certaine, for the more ready search and safe bestowing of them; whereby it falleth out verie often that after the death of such a Clarke, these records are hardly recovered, and that piecemeale, from his widow, servans, or executors, who at their pleasure may embesel, misuse, or conceale what they will.*

Another difficulty which, in England particularly, the student of early local records frequently encounters, is that, unless he himself is well equipped with the requisite paleographical and linguistic knowledge, he may be unable to pursue his researches in the local muniment room, for it is extremely rare to find there employed one with the expert knowledge necessary for the decipherment of ancient documents. Thus it is important, for the slow beginner in such research, to know first how much of his material is already in print. To that end is given, at the end of this article, a list of such works as will most easily assist him to locate, not only what is in print of the collections of the particular local repository or class of document in which he is interested, but also the contents of that repository, if a calendar or any sort of indication exists.

At present, calendars of the records of several counties have been printed or partially compiled. Moreover, extracts from the proceedings of Quarter Sessions are frequently included in the publications of local historical societies, and the Historical Manuscripts Commission has reported on the county records of Essex, Somerset, Wiltshire and Worcestershire. The records of some counties have been printed in part by local authorities, *i.e.* Middlesex, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, Worcestershire, Shropshire, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire, and learned societies have produced those of Somerset, Wiltshire, Yorkshire,† and Northamptonshire.

* *Eirenarcha*, Book IV, c. 3, pp. 7-8, quoted in the 1902 Report, p. 7.

† 1919 Report, p. 11.

Municipal Records.

Few boroughs have records older than the thirteenth century; in many, they begin in the fourteenth or fifteenth, and in large part have survived in the borough repositories. As for the records themselves, the modern distinction of corporate and non-corporate boroughs is immaterial, for in the nineteenth century many a town of ancient importance, with records equal in value to its age, lost its corporate status, while others, increasing in size from mere villages by a constantly growing population, became incorporated. It is a most unfortunate fact that when a borough has been disfranchised its records have usually been lost or wrongfully disposed of, though where a semblance of local government has lived on, with a town clerk and a town hall, the records too have lived on in their accustomed custody. It is therefore necessary to know something of a town's history in the nineteenth century, and before, if we would postulate the type of record that would be produced there, and its present resting-place. Some towns have never been corporate bodies, but have, or once had, valuable collections of records. On the other hand, some, which have enjoyed a parliamentary franchise for many centuries, have never possessed any records. In some cases even county boroughs have no early municipal history and therefore no historic records. Many, old and new, have lost the bulk of their ancient treasures by careless neglect, fire, water or theft. In boroughs incorporated by prescription rather than by grant, there will be no series of royal charters, the administrative records will be of little importance, and the judicial records mostly in the possession of the lord of the manor.

A brief account of the legislation dealing with towns in the nineteenth century will help to elucidate the present distribution of their records. The Municipal Corporations Act of 1835 disfranchised more than a hundred parliamentary boroughs. Their records, however, remained in the custody of the old governing bodies (though it is possible that some disappeared at that time, for many were deposited with the Commissioners in connection with the drawing up of the Reports of 1835 and 1880, and, as the official archives of both Commissions have disappeared, no further details are forthcoming).^{*} The old judicial and administrative procedure continued in many towns until the Municipal Corporations Acts of 1882 and 1883 ended it. These acts made no direct provision

^{*} Hall, H., *op. cit.*, p. 117.

for the records which had thus become derelict, except to include them under the term "property" for the due administration of which the "local authority" was made responsible. The Act of 1882 invoked the Charitable Trusts Act of 1853, which vests the common property of municipalities in trustees, while the Act of 1883 provided for schemes to be made, in certain cases, by the Charity Commissioners and the Local Government Board. The essential was omitted from the Acts; no provision was made requiring the handing over of existing records, by their custodians, to the new authorities, and "most of the records, known to have been in the possession of these boroughs, have been deliberately or wantonly dispersed since 1883." * Further, few schemes have been issued, or measures taken, under the Acts, and where schemes have been put forward, the vague schedules of the records set forth tempt to the conclusion that the latter have not been inspected.† Occasionally, the seemingly missing records of a borough are to be found in the rightful possession of the lord of the manor, for many of the boroughs of England and Wales were so only by prescription and thus came under the jurisdiction of the lord of the manor. The "disintegration of the disfranchised boroughs" was completed by the Local Government Acts of 1888 and 1894; by these, towns not already recognised as county or non-county boroughs were grouped as Urban and Rural Districts, and thus, in the matter of local government, and the custody of their records, the individuality of many an ancient and "richly documented" town and parish was destroyed. Nor was any further provision made for the custody of their now derelict records. Unless Town Trusts have firmly taken possession or some scheme been arrived at, the records of non-corporate boroughs have been left to their fate.

It will have been gathered that it is not always easy to discover whether, in the first place, a town possesses records, and, in the second, of what those records consist, and which of them exist in print.

An attempt was made to obtain some information about town records by the Royal Commission on the Public Records, which reported its findings in 1837. That report contained valuable knowledge, but it related to a comparatively small number of important

* Hall, H., *op. cit.*, p. 118.

† There is a list of these schemes and the boroughs concerned in App. XIII of 1902 Report.

towns, while the form of the returns made by the local officials was governed by the definite queries of the Commissioners, which made special mention of individual classes of records, and even excluded all documents after the Revolution. The returns made to the Committee on Local Records, published in 1902, are classified under county and non-county boroughs, and the lists are very incomplete, for several towns made no return at all, and the information given by others, as to the nature and condition of their records, was unsatisfactory. For example, judicial records are almost entirely overlooked. The Historical MSS. Commission, appointed in 1869, have reported, in the course of years, on seventy-two or more municipal collections, as they have of the counties,* and, except in a few cases (they are on the increase) where a town possesses a good modern calendar of its records, their reports still afford the fullest available information about them.† There is, however, no guarantee that the list of records given by them in their reports is exhaustive, nor is there any uniform scheme of classification or description. As Dr. Hall points out, "Proceedings in the Law Courts" is an inadequate description of records where a town possesses Quarter Sessions, Court of Record, Court Leet, etc., as are "Sessions rolls in large numbers," and "Several Court Books belonging to the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries." "Rolls, after 1648, not examined" suggests a possibility of very serious omissions.‡ The Reports of the Municipal Corporations Commissions of 1835 and 1876-1880 were founded on actual inspection, but they are mainly valuable as giving a list of boroughs, and as a guide to the various records which may once have existed there, for they mention courts, guilds, local customs and charities.

To sum up, there is not in being a complete list of (1) the boroughs which have records at this present time, and (2) the existing records, since nowhere does the information exist from which that list may be compiled. Dr. Charles Gross's superlatively excellent *Bibliography of British Municipal History*, still the indispensable guide to those at work on town records, is unfortunately somewhat out of date—it was published in 1897—and a new edition is very badly needed, because many towns which figure in his work, and in the 1837 Report, are now devoid of local archives, while others,

* See list in 1919 Report, App. I, No. 14.

† Hall, H., *op. cit.*, p. 120.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 120.

not included, have been found to possess interesting documents. The 1919 Report states that apparently no definite information is available about the records of more than a hundred of the ancient boroughs of England and Wales. Dr. Hall, in his *Repertory of British Archives*, gives, in Appendix B (p. 257), a list of towns known to possess records, which he has compiled from all possible sources, but with the warning that his list is neither "exhaustive nor authoritative," because of the untrustworthy nature of some of the sources from which it was made.

When they are in being, municipal records are of a most heterogeneous character, so much so that they well-nigh defy classification, and are moreover often of enormous bulk, for they have been found to be fairly complete, especially in the case of county boroughs, and larger towns in urban districts, *e.g.* Exeter, York, Norwich, Preston, Gloucester, Bristol, Shrewsbury, Chester, Lincoln, Oxford, Reading, Winchester, Maidstone, and Hertford. Probably no town approaches London in either the quality or the importance of its records, of which only a small part has been printed or calendared.

These are related in many instances to affairs of national significance. But even in the case of comparatively small towns of great age, which have been fortunately exempt from the ravages of war, fire, and ignorant officials, "the mountains of venerable documents can be estimated only by the cartload or the ton." * And this is often but a fragment of what should have survived. †

An inspection of the records themselves reveals the almost universal occurrence of certain types. Occupying the most conspicuous place in every inventory, and the object of the tenderest care on the part of their custodians, are the royal and local charters, title-deeds, royal writs and other such instruments, together with official correspondence. The charters and letters patent may be for incorporation, the holding of fairs and markets, or for privileges and immunities of various kinds. Many of the documents relate to guilds, schools, hospitals, charities or trusts, with an independent "corporate or quasi-corporate existence," which became, in time, closely associated with the town government. The charters of course are the originals, of which there are transcripts in the Rolls of

* Hearnshaw, F. J. C., *Municipal Records*, p. 21, published by the S.P.C.K. in the *Helps to Students of History* series. This is a very useful little book of some forty-six pages.

† For specific instances of destruction, see the 1902 Report, p. 27, and Appendix, *passim*.

Chancery. Most towns, when they begin on the publication of their ancient documents, commence with these.*

The administrative proceedings of the town comprise an infinite variety of subjects. They include the Stewards', Chamberlains', and other accounts, these being amongst the most difficult of borough documents to interpret, because of the technical terms employed and the use of Roman numerals. These may be variously known as the accounts of Mayors, Bailiffs, Water-Bailiffs, Receivers of Rent, Keepers or Governors, Sheriffs, Treasurers, etc. Gild rolls and ordinances are usually to be found, together with apprentice indentures, though the actual records of the craft gilds are seldom amongst municipal archives, since these were not, like the merchant gild, "organs of the whole community." There are, however, numerous references to them and their ordinances.

The Assembly Books contain the minutes of the proceedings of the governing body of the town. Most interesting local variations occur in the names given to such records. They include such designations as the *Bench Book* (Kingston-upon-Hull), *Burghmote Book*, *Coucher Book* (Richmond, Yorks), *Cross Book* (Cambridge), *Dormont Book* (Carlisle), *Locked Book* (Leicester), *Court Leet Book* (Bridgwater), *Admiralty and Ship-way Book* (Cinque Ports), *Cutthorn Book*, etc. In some cases these are supplemented by most illuminating books of examinations and depositions, containing every sort of preliminary inquiry and investigation, lists of officials, oaths, letters, and all kinds of memoranda. Besides the above, the municipal muniment room will probably contain also maps, terriers, and rentals, subsidy rolls and assessments, muster rolls, views of armour, accounts of highways, bridges, burial boards, sacramental certificates, registers of mayors, aldermen, burgesses, freemen, jurors, officers, and apprentice rolls, etc. It is impossible to say what may not be included, especially in the series of "Minutes and Orders."

Where a town exercised a wide variety of local activities and powers, its proceedings in such connections are usually to be found in a separate series of books and rolls. Sometimes these records are on files, or entered in books, "sometimes they are in bundles of loose papers, as at Aldeburgh and Stratford-on-Avon." Special types of records exist in some towns, though why that is so is somewhat difficult to state. Examples occur in the *Orphan Books* of Bristol

* Hearnshaw, F. J. C., *op. cit.*, p. 25. See Ballard, A., *British Borough Charters*.

and other cities ; the *Customs Records* of Chester ; the archives of the Eastland Merchants of York, and the Ostmen of Newcastle-on-Tyne ; the records of Carlisle horse-fair, and the Lincoln " Dyke Tolls."

The records of judicial proceedings, found in the municipal muniment room, will correspond to the various jurisdictions exercised by the borough. They relate, generally, according to the status of the borough, to one or more of the following. Every city or borough had some kind of a civil court for the hearing of petty local disputes. It usually sat every month or three weeks, was presided over by the mayor, and is known variously as the Court of Record, the Court of Pleas, the Mayor's Court, the Borough Court, the Port mote. Its proceedings were entered on the court rolls. Chartered towns usually gained, besides, the right to hold a criminal Court of Quarter Sessions. Towns with fairs had an annual Pie Powder Court ; those that were ports had an Admiralty Court. There occur also a Court of Hustings, a Sheriff's Court, and a Court Leet and view of frankpledge, for the appointment of certain officers and the presentment of nuisances. The records of some of these courts extend from the thirteenth or the fourteenth centuries to the time when they ceased to be, or to the present day, if they have survived all the vicissitudes of history. The records of judicial proceedings contain such varieties of matter as the presentations of jurors and constables, coroners' inquisitions and rolls, proceedings in connection with the Assizes of Bread and Ale, depositions, gaol deliveries, proceedings in connection with the Gild Merchant, inrolments of wills, recognizances, etc.

Lastly, separate mention must be made, in a description of municipal records, of those books of miscellaneous memoranda of which most old towns possess examples. In these was entered much secret and important information, and copies of the wills of prominent burgesses, etc. They have various names, *e.g.* the *Black Book*, *The Red Book*, *Oak Book*, *Chain Book*. With these must be noted the town chronicles, though only about three dozen in all of these are extant. Of great historical interest, drawn up in the form of annals, they contain the names of the chief civic officers, together with brief notices of municipal and national events occurring in successive mayoralties. They vary greatly in fullness, some becoming here and there almost a narrative of national affairs. Such are those of London, of which the oldest was completed in

1274.* Others are mere catalogues of mayors, with a few slight memoranda of municipal business. At Bristol, *The Maire of Bristowe is Kalendar*, was compiled by Robert Ricart, town clerk there from 1479 to c. 1506.† Bristol has several calendars still in existence. The majority, however, of town chronicles are in manuscript and not in a municipal repository. Many are housed in the British Museum. Had they been properly safeguarded, they would have been in their old homes. It is fortunate that some at least are in their present resting-places, and have not been sold as waste paper or carted away as rubbish.‡

The student then may find what he requires from municipal records in print, and lucky will he be if he has occasion to use some of the very excellent printed editions of Borough Records which do exist; e.g. Miss Mary Bateson's of Leicester, or Mr. W. H. Stevenson's of Nottingham. A reference to Gross's *Bibliography* (1897), Humphreys's *Handbook to County Bibliography* (1917), and to Hall's *Repertory* (1920)§ will assist him in discovering what is in print. There must be borne in mind, too, the work being done, in the printing of original documents, by the local Record Societies, which have come into being all over the country. Here the "Academies" index and catalogues in the British Museum will be found invaluable. There is, however, great need of a subject index to all such publications as a whole; such an index as the Sussex Archaeological Society has compiled for its own productions.

It may, however, be necessary to visit a local municipal muniment room, and here a personal experience may be of some help to the, as yet, untried worker.

* See a series of 15th century chronicles, edited by the late C. L. Kingsford, *Chronicles of London* (1905), introduction; and his *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century* (1913), ch. iv, and Appendix.

† Printed by the Camden Society in 1872.

‡ See Gross, Ch., *Bibliography of British Municipal History*, pp. xiv et seq., and 1902 Report, p. 27.

§ Or the very useful collection of the lists of the publications of learned societies, alphabetically arranged, which is rapidly taking shape, and being kept up to date, in the British Room at the Institute of Historical Research.

(To be continued.)

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

"THEY SLEEPE ALL THE ACT"

IN a reply to Sir Mark Hunter (*R.E.S.*, October 1927) on the subject of act-divisions in the plays of Shakespeare, I threw out the suggestion that such divisions, which are found in many folio, but in no quarto, texts, may have been introduced for the first time in 1609, when the company began to play at Blackfriars, a "private" playhouse with strong musical traditions, music and act-intervals being commonly associated together, then as now. In the same article I emphasised once again, as illustrating the shifts to which the players might be put by the introduction of such pauses, the stage-direction or prompter's note printed at the head of these observations, which is found at the end of Act 3 in the folio (but not the quarto) text of *M.N.D.*, and implies without a doubt that the four lovers are to lie "sleeping" on the open stage during the interval between the acts.

Commenting upon this in *R.E.S.*, January 1928, Mr. W. J. Lawrence argues that the business of the lovers sleeping through the act-interval must have been familiar to London audiences years before 1609 inasmuch as *Histrionastix*, an old play revised by Marston about 1599, contains a burlesque not only of the machinery of *M.N.D.* in general but also of "this unique situation" in particular. Now, though I yield to no man in my admiration of Mr. Lawrence's work on the history of the Elizabethan stage, I have learnt that it is wise to check his facts. I therefore turned to look for them in Farmer's facsimile of the 1610 text of *Histrionastix*, and found that they were simply not there! It is true that there is mists, as Fluellen might say, in both plays, and that a group of characters in both fall asleep on the stage, as they do for instance in *The Tempest* and in many other plays of the period. On the other hand, whereas in *M.N.D.* the mist is the agency by which the lovers are all brought together into one place for their sleep, in *Histrionastix* it has nothing to do with the "sleep" at all, from which indeed it is

separated by a whole act, and is merely a stage-device for getting one group off the boards to make room for another. Again while the sleep in one case is the result of weariness, in the other it is caused by wine. Furthermore, the lovers are roused by huntsmen's horns, Mavortius and his companions by the breath of Envy. In a word, I find it impossible to believe that an audience, however familiar with the *Dream*, would detect any parody of it as they sat watching *Histriomastix*.

That, Mr. Lawrence may retort, is a matter of opinion, and I should agree. Nay, if he wishes, I will even grant the possibility that, at the time, *Histriomastix* (1599) was recognised as an elaborate travesty of the *Dream* (1598). This however proves nothing regarding the Folio stage-direction (first printed in 1623), upon which the whole argument turns. What Mr. Lawrence has to prove is that the Mavortius group in *Histriomastix* sleep upon the stage, to quote his words, "in full sight right through the act-interval" at the end of Act 3. And this he is quite unable to do, because it is perfectly evident from the text that Acts 3 and 4 were played continuously. In a word, *there is no interval between the acts* for Mavortius to sleep through. Towards the end of the third act there is a banquet at which Mavortius and the rest drink and quarrel. Then follows this stage-direction :

*They speake and fall a sleepe on the Stage. Sound Musicke.
Enter Envy alone to all the Actors sleeping on the Stage ; the musicke sounding :
shee breaths amongst them.*

Thereupon the act concludes with an 18-line speech by Envy, terminating thus :

Awake ye Brawne-fed Epicures, looke vp,
And when you thinke your clearest eyes to finde,
Be all their Organs strooke with Enuie blind. *Exit.*
They all awake, and begin the following Acte.

The new act is headed "Actus 4, Scæna 1," and opens with a speech by Mavortius ; but the act-division is for the benefit of the reader alone, since on the stage the awakening and the words of Mavortius must of necessity follow immediately upon Envy's speech. Nor is this the only instance in the text, as Sir Mark Hunter may care to note, of a purely literary act-heading. Acts 2 and 3 are similarly continuous in action on the stage, though there is a change of scene in this case, since Pride enters with her attendants, while Mavortius and the rest, who hold the stage at the end of Act 2, are still "on,"

casts her "mist" in the which Mavortius, etc., vanish, and then takes up her tale, which forms the opening speech of an *actus tertij*, as the text quaintly calls it.

Having rebutted Mr. Lawrence's "rebutting evidence," let me add that though I think it likely that most of the act-divisions were introduced into Shakespearian folio texts after the taking over of Blackfriars in 1609, the *Dream*, as the stock marriage-play of the King's Men, is a rather special case, seeing that it was no doubt sometimes played on nuptial occasions in the halls of noblemen's houses, when intervals might have been convenient and music expected. Indeed, in the "New Shakespeare" edition of the text I actually suggested (p. 159) private performance at a noble wedding as the possible source of the folio version, and such a performance may conceivably have taken place some years before 1609. This is, however, a very different thing from assuming that act-intervals were "received" at the Globe Theatre itself at this period.

J. DOVER WILSON.

DRAMATIC PUBLICATION IN ENGLAND, 1580-1640: A REPLY

DR. GREG has devoted ten pages of *The Review of English Studies* (January 1928) to a careful killing of my book, *Dramatic Publication in England, 1580-1640*, although, he says, it was born dead, being without significance for the present generation, particularly as the writer is assumed to have quit reading fifteen years ago and never to have read any sources in the original when they could be got at second or third hand.

For all his definite indications of positive errors of fact and of form I am sincerely grateful. The sharing of wisdom is a real gift, no matter what the spirit of the giver. The recurrence of epithet and the superlative statements I do not especially resent if Dr. Greg enjoys that kind of book-reviewing. (It reminds me a little of the manner of Francis Jeffrey.) I do object to being discredited by the deceptive and erroneous presentation of certain facts, by the cutting of statements out of their context, and by the reading in of unwarranted inferences.

Throughout the review Dr. Greg labours under a misapprehension as to my subject and the period treated. He seems to

think that I was trying to write a history of the Elizabethan stage, though I disclaim that intention. Had that been my aim, I should undoubtedly, as he suggests, have "scrapped" the work upon the appearance of the notable volumes by Sir Edmund Chambers. But my subject was dramatic publication, and matters of stage history were only incidental to a purpose which was not at all the purpose of Chambers, except in one short chapter on printing and publishing which gave me no reason for discarding my work in that field. Chambers treats in detail the stage and drama of the whole reign of Elizabeth, extending part of his discussion to the year 1616. Two-thirds of my period falls in the seventeenth century. These considerations and the fact that my book had already been accepted by a committee of the Modern Language Association explain why no more extensive changes than the excision of part of Chapter I, which overlapped in topic and period, and the insertion of a few references to Chambers resulted from the appearance of his book. It would indeed have been an advantage if it had come in time for me to assimilate and apply in detail the wealth of the author's knowledge of stage history. But since my subject and period are not, as Dr. Greg imagines, co-extensive with those of Chambers, it happens that my particular errors could rarely have been corrected by reference to these volumes.

In his strictures on slovenliness and inaccuracy in dating, Dr. Greg loses sight of the fact that two-thirds of my period is after 1600, and objects to the introduction of seventeenth-century evidence, as, for example, in my comments on stenography. He is not satisfied with condemning this book, but predicts that an article on stenography as yet unseen will inevitably be wrong as to facts and dates, even offering me a specific error which he seems to hope that I will include—that stenography was taught in the schools of England "as early as 1600." I gave him no reason to expect that. "I would suggest," he says (p. 99), "the expediency of carefully revising her dates, for those here given for Peter Bales's *Brachygraphy* belong to his earlier work *The Writing Schoolmaster*." Dr. Greg is doubly in error. Unless he took his information on this text at second hand, he must know that my dates for the *Brachygraphy* are correct, and are the same as those of *The Writing Schoolmaster*, inasmuch as *The Art of Brachygraphy* is the first book of

The Writing Schoolemaster ; Containing three Bookes in one ; The first teaching Swift writing ; The Second, True writing ; The third,

Faire writing. The first Booke Entituled, The arte of Brachygraphie ; that is, to write as fast as a man speaketh, treatably writing but one letter for a word, etc. . . . The knowledge whereof may easilie be attained by one moneths practise. The prooffe alreadie made by diuers scholers therein. . . . Inuented by Peter Bales. 1 January, 1590. Imprinted by Thomas Orwin : and are to be solde at the Authors house, in the upper end of the Old Bayly, where he teacheth the said Artes.

Copies are at the Archbishop's Library at Lambeth and the Chetham Library, Manchester. The work was entered on the Stationers' Registers, December 1, 1589, and it is described in Herbert's edition of Ames's *Typographical Antiquities* (II, 1245).

Dr. Greg implies (p. 96) that I have 'extended to previous decades' and 'to all playwrights' evidence which I introduce (pp. 204-206) on dramatists' publication of their own plays. The impartial reader may observe that I was at pains to introduce dates and to avoid extension of conclusions. Again (p. 98), I am charged with extending the "alleged association" of the Admiral's men and the Chamberlain's men to 1600 (pp. 267-268). 1600 is clearly assigned to the printing of certain plays and not to the well-known association of these companies, which I mention with proper dates on p. 279.

Much of the "fantastic" inference of which Dr. Greg complains will disappear when the passages are set back into their context and read in order as they occur. If one reverses statements and then, missing a connection, invents a causal sequence, some fantastic inferences are likely to result. For example, he says (p. 98):

Fantastic too is her apparent suggestion that in 1597 the Admiral's men acquired a number of plays from Pembroke's because they were losing control of others belonging to Alleyn and Slaughter.

If one reads p. 281 before 282, as I rather hoped it might be read, he will see that I have assigned the same reason as Greg assigns for the acquisition of plays from Pembroke's by the Admiral's, namely, an amalgamation and the going under of Pembroke's men. I then mention further acquisitions of play copies caused by further changes in make-up of companies, namely, by the withdrawal of two members who are known to have owned play copies. I do not see that I imply any causal connection to indicate that the second acquisition caused the first. It is merely another instance.

To prove that my remarks on re-licensing of old plays are, "as usual, . . . open to serious criticism," Dr. Greg makes a concealed substitution of a "because" relationship for a "though" (p. 96):

We know from Herbert's own record that *The Winter's Tale* was relicensed, not for protection, but because the authorised copy was lost.

The reader may judge whether the "because" is in the record:

For the King's Players. An olde playe called Winter's Tale, formerly allowed of by Sir George Bucke, and likewise by mee on Mr. Hemings his word that there was nothing profane added or reformed, thogh the allowed booke was missinge; and therefore I returned it without a fee.

I have no regret for the "singularly unfortunate" quotation from the bookseller, W. Sheares, concerning Marston's customary oversight of the printing of his plays. Inasmuch as the quotation itself positively indicates that Marston was *not* overseeing the publication of this particular collection, I could hardly be supposed to be trying to prove that he was. I see no point in objecting to the use of Sheares's evidence, because it does imply something as to his earlier habits. I did not introduce the very difficult problem of the bearing on this matter of the various copies of the 1633 collections of Marston's works, because I have had no opportunity to examine the six or more different forms of the work myself, nor have I seen any conclusive discussion by bibliographical experts who have done so. If Dr. Greg has solved this puzzle, he keeps his facts well "up his sleeve" when he explains (p. 97):

Marston, who had entered the Church many years before, was not so far distant but that he was able to insist on all traces of his authorship being removed from the peccant volume.

I should like a reference to some evidence on the matter, especially as the British Museum catalogue states twice that the copy with the Sheares dedication (1077. b. 2) and the collective title-page naming Marston ("The Workes of Mr. John Marston being Tragedies and Comedies collected into one volume") represents the second issue, and that the first is represented by B.M. 644. a. 33, with the title, "Tragedies and Comedies collected into one volume, viz. 1, Antonio and Mellida, etc. . . . A. M[atthews] for W. Sheares. 1633." All six plays are named in order on the title-page, and separate title-

pages are used for the plays. Greg himself, when he compiled his Handlist of plays, indicated copies with Sheares's dedication and the name of Marston on the title-page as showing the "addition" of Sheares's epistle. One copy in the British Museum (11771.aaa) has the title-pages of both issues, *i.e.* the general title-page as in the copy with Sheares's dedication and also the separate title-pages as in the copy which lacks the author's name at the front. Other variants appear, one copy omitting the dedication and substituting the address "To my Equall Reader" from the first edition of *The Fawn*, and lacking also the fourth and sixth plays and two title-pages. It is apparent that there is a real problem for bibliographical experts here. So far as I am aware, it is not satisfactorily worked out. It seemed unwise to pose a problem which would require considerable space even to present in full, and which I cannot solve. One needs evidence for concluding that the copies without the author's name at the front show Marston's refusal to acknowledge his authorship because he had gone into the Church. Every one of the six plays in the "anonymous" volume had been previously printed with Marston's name—some of them with his oversight. Some we know to have circulated for years after he went into the Church. How could he hope to conceal authorship by any such arrangement? And, even if he can be shown to have changed his attitude toward publication in 1633, it should be remembered that in this very epistle of Sheares he is described as "in his autumn and declining age," and that he died June 25, 1634. The significant attitude of Marston was that which he showed when he was a playwright, rather than that of the last year of his life, when he was an elderly clergyman.

I am glad to have my attention called to McKerrow's brief note on Drayton's *Harmonie of the Church*, a note which I had never seen. I followed Bullen, Oliver Elton, and other special students of Drayton in their error of identification of the two *Harmonies*. The probable reason for the quoted misnomer of metrical translation of the Psalms is that Drayton himself, in the preface to his 1591 *Harmonie*, describes his paraphrases as "psalms" which he says are "metrically translated."

Though the example of Drayton fades away, the calling in of the other *Harmonie* equally well illustrates the function of the Stationers' Company in recall of books. I do not quite know why Dr. Greg says, "She thinks that the calling in of a book through the

Stationers' Company was a 'rather common method' (p. 94), and suggests that this stands or falls with Drayton's *Harmonie*. All one needs to do is to turn to Arber's *Transcripts of the Stationers' Registers* to find all the examples he requires.

"My Lo. of London" who, according to a contemporary letter, objected to the playing of *Barnaveit* (see my quotation, p. 187) is indicated as the Bishop of London in the calendaring of this letter (*S.P. Dom.* 1619-1623, vol. cx, art. 18). As the bishops and archbishops were long concerned in such matters, I saw no reason for doubting the interpretation or substituting Mayor. Dr. Greg seems suspicious of ecclesiastical censorship of literature on grounds of propriety. Ovid's *Elegies* were certainly objected to and ordered to be burned before the date of Sandys's translations of the *Metamorphoses*. There are several indications that some objection was made to Ovid as reading matter in England. My suggestion in regard to a possible motive for cancellation of the entry of the translation of the *Metamorphoses* is, I think, not unreasonable. I should not, of course, have made it had I had access to the unprinted Order of the Court of Stationers from which Dr. Greg quotes a bit (p. 95) which requires the cancelling of entries of Sandys's translation for all printers concerned "for that noe man shall laye anie claime to the printinge of the same or any parte thereof."

Dr. Greg goes on to say, "The Order supplies yet more evidence, were it needed, that at the time no one dreamed that an author enjoyed any copyright at common law." More evidence certainly is needed, and if it is of a piece with this, it will not serve as an argument against the existence of common law copyright. As any one familiar with copyright law must know, editions and translations of the classics have long been subject to special treatment in regard to recognition of ownership, the question whether editing and translating constituted original work in which one might have a property being debated even in the eighteenth century. Lapse of ownership by the original author and his heirs in the course of time was thought to justify the Stationers' Company in their sixteenth- and seventeenth-century practice of sometimes using the classics with other derelicts as common stock for the company, especially because of this uncertainty as to what constituted an original work—an uncertainty which appears in some of the patents of the time. A further reason why this cancellation of ownership does not tell against ordinary common law copyright is that it

concerns an artificial privilege, a monopoly, or patent constituting a special grant for a term of years. This form of printing-right was concurrent with common law copyright, but was on a quite separate basis.

Several "vague" and "meaningless" passages cited by Dr. Greg from my book become clear if placed in their context. For example, the reference to the seeming presence of two Pembroke's men with the Strange-Chamberlain Company (p. 280). How could this be meaningless to Dr. Greg, when the men are named in a footnote directly attached to the sentence, and a reference given to a discussion by Murray with which he is perfectly familiar, having written on the problem himself? I should have been glad to refer to Greg also if I had been sure of his latest views. To refer to Chambers would not have satisfied Greg in this case, for Chambers is taken to task by him on this problem for inconclusiveness, and I cannot see that Greg has settled the matter in his review of Chambers. In the circumstances, will the reader pardon me, as I am not a stage historian, for referring to one fairly clear discussion, instead of dragging all the details into my text, when all I wished to illustrate was a point of contact between two companies? Mr. Greg cannot resist the temptation to declare that he cannot believe that I have "even attempted to understand the rather complicated evidence," merely because I refrain from bewildering the reader with a small and unsolved problem. When I go into details of theatrical history elsewhere, he lectures me on plunging into "the Serbonian bog of theatrical history." To discuss these details and not to discuss them seem to be equally reprehensible.

America is not to blame for my "queer" and "slipshod" writing, where I use *cartoon* to indicate a satirical portraiture of Gondomar in a play where he was depicted "to the very life" in his "cast off apparel and litter." See the *New English Dictionary*, under the verb, for British usage in that sense in the 'eighties. The American language is my native dialect, but never until I read Dr. Greg's review did I imagine that it could constitute such a barrier in the expression of my meaning to an Englishman.

I do not see why he concludes: "One never knows whether what she is combating is the view that most plays were surreptitiously printed, or (without actually saying it) that any plays were." I discuss evidences of surreptitious and piratical printing, and refer a number of times to Pollard's skill in testing some of the quartos.

Dr. Greg complains that he cannot get the "drift of the argument" in the chapter on the text. That was intended to be chiefly expository, and as Dr. Greg knew all the facts before, it probably put him to sleep. There is only a shade of argument, on one topic, as concluded on p. 384: "A pirated text may usually be expected to be worse than an unpirated one; but if occasional better ones can be found, it is clear that corruption of text is no infallible sign of piracy." I wished to suggest that each text suspected of piracy be critically examined on its own merits, with an understanding of the printing customs, and with an attempt at that sort of bibliographical approach illustrated by the modern work of such men as Greg, Pollard, McKerrow, and others of their school of thought. That is my poisonous message to the "junior students."

I do not see why I should be supposed to approve Hubbard's theory on the first quarto of *Hamlet* because I barely mention its existence. I had just finished praising Pollard very heartily for his discriminating work on that and other texts; so that my preference should be clear without my stopping to hurl offensive epithets at Mr. Hubbard to show that his theory does not convince me.

I disclaim any "definite, however innocent, misrepresentation" of Pollard's theory on *Richard II.* with regard to interpretation of "sound errors." I took special pains not to misrepresent, in that I inserted a parenthesis "(contrary to the usual custom of compositors)" to indicate that Pollard is not here committing himself to a view I criticised (p. 326), namely, that it was a common practice to set up text by use of dictation. The only quotable sentence that could have expressed Mr. Pollard's view in connection with the point happens to be one which for the casual reader would have made him seem to commit himself to belief in a more general use of dictation (p. 97):

On the other hand, the fact that more than once we find a suggestion that Sims was obliged to help a compositor by dictating the text to him (see pp. 35, 59) suggests that the manuscript was probably not written in a specially clerky hand.

But Mr. Greg insists, "What Mr. Pollard suggested was that certain errors were best explained by supposing that Sims occasionally helped his compositor in deciphering an obscure manuscript." What does this mean—that the help was not by dictation, as Mr. Pollard explicitly states it was? If so, what happens to the theory?

What of the errors in the text, the *Ah* as a dictator's grunt, etc., and what of the inference of bad handwriting as the reason for the dictation that caused the textual errors? Mr. Pollard would not wish to be excused from mention of dictation, but only from seeming to believe that this was the customary practice, as he has elsewhere stated his convictions on that point.

Mr. Greg has a right to complain of the strange hash made of two speeches from the quarto of *Merry Wives of Windsor* (p. 305). I am unable to say how this happened, as I used his text, and my notes and original manuscript are set up with the right line division and the speeches properly separated. The only guess I can offer is that the absence of capitals at beginnings of lines may have led a well-meaning corrector at the press to improve on my version. The speeches were separate as I studied them, and I do not argue from their junction.

I suppose it is useless to state that a few errors, such as *broken* for *bookes* and *Sanders* for *Sandes* actually are typographical errors, and that some others are accidental rather than due to a state of original sin. In his review of E. K. Chambers' *The Elizabethan Stage* (*R.E.S.*, i, 108-109), Greg lists numerous errors, some of them nearly, if not quite, as astonishing and unaccountable as mine. These he condones, and wisely does not suggest deliberate falsification, use of second- and third-hand sources, failure to attempt to verify, etc., as he does with regard to me. He does, however, make the somewhat disturbing suggestion (p. 108):

But what has not mislead [*read misled*!] Dr. Chambers may mislead others in a work which students will consult with implicit confidence for generations to come, and I feel bound to enter a word of warning that if they rely on the present volumes to the exclusion of the original authorities they will be at times—perhaps deservedly—deceived.

Space forbids him to give more than a few examples of each class of error. So he severely restricts himself to two more pages. But if Sir Edmund felt a bit dashed on seeing these evidences of general unreliability, he may now take heart if he reads Greg's review of my poor book; for not only could his book alone check all my errors (even on topics he did not treat), but it is actually recognised as having killed the dragon Error in England. In less than five years it has led all good British scholars out of that fog, that bog, that mist, that jungle of textual theories based on speculations as to theatrical companies and such topics, and has ushered in an age when

textual theory is science, is history, so that to doubt even one or two such theories is equivalent to promulgating a theory of cynicism and pessimism, a philosophy of despair. The sermon begun on E. K. Chambers because of some one little doubt (*R.E.S.*, i, 1925, p. 106), on the text, "The certainty of history can never be the certainty of mathematics," is now addressed to me (*R.E.S.*, January 1928, p. 100), on the text, "Does she look for the certainty of deductive logic in the world of concrete fact? A theory is only an hypothesis in which we believe, and all history, no less than all science, is founded on such. . . . Miss Albright's general conclusion is the sceptical one that the evidence we are able to observe seldom, if ever, justifies any definite conclusion." All this, apparently, because I expressed a very mild doubt as to a string of three successive hypotheses in one particular theory of Mr. Pollard's in regard to *Richard II.*—and possibly because I also ventured to raise some objections to the traitor-actor theory in connection with *Merry Wives*. I have gladly lent belief to most of Mr. Pollard's and Mr. Greg's theories—even to some which are highly ingenious. For doubting two of their many theories must I be charged with "an attack on the possibility of critical knowledge"?

EVELYN MAY ALBRIGHT.

Jan. 17, 1928.

[The above has been shown in proof to Dr. W. W. Greg, who writes as follows:]

I am very sorry indeed if I in any way misrepresented Miss Albright's book, the substantial merits of which I quite recognise. It must be for readers to judge. I explained that I found it often difficult to follow her drift, and I evidently sometimes mistook her meaning: naturally, knowing herself what her intention was, she takes a different view of her work from that which I was able to form. A case in point is that of *Richard II.* I maintain that she did misrepresent Mr. Pollard. She said no word to suggest that what he postulated was *occasional* dictation of an obscure passage, and any reader would naturally take her parenthesis as emphasizing that his assumption was contrary to custom: it never entered my head that she was agreeing with his view. And the last thing I should do would be to blame her for doubting his theory concerning *Richard II.*, or for rejecting my theory of *The Merry Wives*—which is, indeed, very likely mistaken. But she seemed to object to Mr. Pollard's as being hypothetical; and I do not see how it could be anything else.

To say that I predicted that a future article would be wrong in facts and dates is absurd. I suggested that she should check certain dates.

She has done so, and it has enabled her to get back on me. Of course, I ought to have gone to Lambeth and looked up *The Writing Schoolmaster*—I have now done so. Instead I relied on the *S.T.C.* (1311-12), which makes it appear as though this and the *Brachygraphy* were distinct works. I apologise.

I must be as brief as I can in dealing with Miss Albright's points. She twice emphasised the close relation of the Admiral's and Chamberlain's men in connexion with the release of plays in 1600. Is it strange that I supposed her to mean that they were related at the relevant date? Anyhow, she does say that "from 1592 to 1598 they continued their co-operation," though this ceased definitely in June 1594. She was apparently misled by Tucker Murray. The few words about the Admiral's and Pembroke's men on p. 281 do not give the same account of their amalgamation as I did; and Miss Albright does appear to me to imply a motive for the acquisition of the Pembroke plays that cannot be reconciled with the facts. But I am not at all clear as to her meaning: there was only one "acquisition."

The inference that *The Winter's Tale* required relicensing (with a view either to printing or acting) because the licensed copy was lost seems to me obvious and as certain as such inferences can be.

Miss Albright cited Sheares as evidence for the practice of authorial revision. He alleged that had Marston been at hand he would have supervised the collection. The evidence goes to show that had Marston been present he would have done his best to suppress it. Her selection of a witness was "unfortunate." I did not intend to blame her for not knowing the history of the volume. But this is really quite simple, and she can now study it in Mr. Brettell's recent article in *The Library* (viii, 343-4).

Of course books were sometimes suppressed by or through the Stationers' Company, but Miss Albright's one example was a ghost. And I think it is matter for criticism that while she culled material from such sources as *The Bookworm*—a sort of bibliographical "Snappy-Bits"—she neglected to work through the file of *The Library*, and confesses that she now sees Dr. McKerrow's note for the first time.

The *Barnavelt* matter is more important than might at first appear, for it raises a constitutional point. The Bishop had nothing to do with the control of the stage. The improbability was long ago pointed out by Fleay and recognised by Creizenach (see Miss Frylinck's edition, p. xix).

I cannot possibly enter here into the question of copyright. Suffice it to say that no evidence worth considering has yet been adduced to show that any form of copyright or stage-right was recognised in the seventeenth century as enforceable at common law.

Miss Albright's statement about Pembroke's men ran: "In 1593 the list of characters in the *True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York* showed two of Pembroke's men to be acting with the Strange-Chamberlain company." If any one can attach a meaning to this sentence he is cleverer than I am. I will admit, for the sake of argument, that the manuscript of the *True Tragedy*, though not printed till 1595, may have existed in 1593, and that

the play is substantially the same as 3 *Henry VI*. But how can a "list of characters" show anything about actors? Does she mean a "list of actors"? There is none. And how could anything in a Pembroke play show that any one was acting with another company? The facts are that the names of three actors are incidentally mentioned in stage-directions, not in the *True Tragedy*, but in 3 *Henry VI* as printed in the Shakespeare folio of 1623. That the manuscript from which the play was then printed was at one time in the hands of Pembroke's men is an assumption which may or may not be true. But if the actors' names were inserted in it when it was with Pembroke's men their presence can be no evidence that they passed with the manuscript to Strange's, and if they were inserted when it was with Strange's men their presence can be no evidence that they were ever with Pembroke's.

Miss Albright used "cartoon" as a noun, not as a verb. The noun means a drawing, often though not necessarily satirical, and not "a satirical portraiture" in words or on the stage. I am told that the American usage is the same. I was very sensible of the barrier of language that divided me from Miss Albright, but curiously enough I do not usually feel this in reading the work of American scholars.

Of course I never suggested that Miss Albright was guilty of "deliberate falsification." I know that she is incapable of anything of the sort.

W. W. GREG.

A NOTE ON RICHARD EDWARDS

THE two-part play of *Palamon and Arcite*, written by Richard Edwards and presented before Queen Elizabeth at Oxford in the autumn of 1566, has completely disappeared, although accounts of the plot and of the queen's delight in it are preserved. She was especially charmed by the young actor who took the role of Emily, and to him gave eight angels "for gatheringe her flowers prettily in the garden and singinge sweetlie in the pryme of March." Judging from Dr. Leicester Bradner's recent monograph on *The Life and Poems of Richard Edwards* (1927), attention has not heretofore been called to the appearance of one of Emily's songs in a seventeenth-century manuscript in the British Museum, Additional 26,737, fol. 106^v. Obviously this "Elegie on the death of a Sweetheart" was sung in the second part of the play, after the death of Arcite, and as it is apparently the only scrap of Edwards's *Palamon and Arcite* yet found, a reprint may be welcomed.

The style of these verses is unmistakably that of Edwards, whose name, indeed, is signed. Furthermore, the manuscript contains

other poems of his composition ; as, " In going to my naked bed " (fols. 106^v-107), " The sailing ships with joy at length " (fol. 107), and " When May is in his prime " (fols. 108-108^v),* earlier copies of which are to be found in my edition of the *Paradise of Dainty Devices*, 1576, pp. 50-51, 27-28, 9-10.

AN ELEGIE ON THE DEATH OF A SWEETHEART

Come followe mee ye Nymphes,
whose eyes are never drye :
Augment yo' wailleinge numbers now
with mee poore Emeley.
Give place yee to my plainter,
whose ioyes are pincht wth paine
My love, alas, through fowle mishapp,
most cruell death hath slayne.

What witt can will, alas,
my sorrowes to indite ?
I wayle & want my new desire
I lacke my new delight.
Gush out my tricklinge teares,
like mighty floudes of rayne :
My knight, alas, through fowle myshap
most cruell death hath slayne.

Oh hap, alas, most hard
oh death why diddst thou so ?
Why could not I embrace my ioy ?
for mee that bidd such woe.
ffalse fortune out, alas,
Woe worth thy subtile trayne :
Whereby my love through fowle myshap
most cruell death hath slayne.

Rocke mee asleepe in woe,
yow wofull Sisters three :
Oh, cutt yo^e of my fatall threed,
dispatch poore Emeley.
Why should I live, alas,
and linger thus in paine ?
ffarewell my life, syth that my love
most cruell death hath slayne.

The songe of Emelye per Edwardes.

For what it may be worth I add a song (which might be called " The Praise of his Mistress, Queen Elizabeth ") attributed to " Edwardes " in a Bodleian manuscript (Tanner 306, fols. 176-176^v). The diction, the movement of the lines, the style in general, are an exact approximation to those of Richard Edwards ; and his authorship of the poem hardly seems questionable.

* Cf. also " When women first dame nature made " (fol. 107^v) with the poem printed by Bradner, pp. 104-105.

The musses nyne that cradle rockte
 wherin my noble m^{re} laie
 and all the graces then they flokte
 soe Ioyfull of that happie daie
 that then w^h silver sowndinge voice
 gan altogether to reioyce

Ther chirppinge Charme did nature praise
 whose fame alowde, they all did ringe
 of royall lynne that she did raise
 a princes by that noble kinge
 whose memorie dothe yet revive
 all courtlie *states* * wightes that be alive

And when this sollemer songe was done
 in counsell grave they satt streight waye
 w^h smyllinge chere then one begonne
 faire oratour theis wordes to saie
 behold qd she my sister deare
 how natures giftes doe here appere

Let vs therfore not seme vnkinde
 as nature hathe the bodie deckte
 soe let our giftes adorne the mynde
 of the godes lest we be checkte
 and you three graces in like sorte
 awaight vppon her princelie porte

To this w^h handes caste vp on highe
 theis ladies all gave ther consent
 and kissinge her most lovinglie
 from whence they came to heaven they went
 ther giftes yet remayne yet here behinde
 to bewtifie my m^{re} Mynde

[Fol. 176] W^h geuen to her in tender yeres
 by tracte of tyme of soe encreate
 apreles † prince that she apperes
 and of her kynde passinge the rest
 as farre in skill as dothe in sight
 the sonne excell the candle light

No wonder then thoughe noble hartes
 of sondrie sortes her love dothe seke
 her will to wynne they play ther partes
 happie is he whom she shall like
 to god yet is this my request
 hym to have her that loves her best

finis. qd Edwardes

HYDER E. ROLLINS.

* Underlined to show that it is to be omitted.

† A peerless?

FORERUNNERS OF THE SPENSERIAN STANZA

MISS POPE, in her excellent article on the Italian sources of the Spenserian stanza,* finds its closest parallel in the eight-line madrigal, itself a derivative of the *terza rima*. She cites a common type of rime-scheme, *ababcbb*, as the most probable source, and points out that the insertion of a *b* rime after the first quatrain would give us Spenser's rime-scheme exactly. The nine-line madrigal, the normal Italian length, does not provide her with any useful parallels, for all the examples she cites use four rimes instead of three and do not show the linking of the concluding couplet to the rest of the stanza. I believe that it is this last peculiarity which makes this particular type of madrigal significant as an influence on Spenser. In regard to other characteristics of the Spenserian stanza, I wish to present some material from sources not considered by Miss Pope in her article.

I take it that the three notable features of the rime-scheme invented by Spenser are the medial couplet, the concluding couplet, and the *c* rime in the sixth line connecting the latter to the rest of the stanza. I am not aware that any one has called attention to the appearance in *Tottel's Miscellany* of two nine-line stanzas which approximate Spenser's scheme. The first † is arranged *abababacc*, and the second *ababaabcc*; ‡ both are among the section of "uncertain authors." It will be noticed that both of these forms use only three rimes, as does Spenser, and also that they both end with a couplet. The second requires only a change in lines 5 and 6 to make it into the Spenserian form. Spenser undoubtedly was familiar with Tottel's collection, and the probability is strong that, with his interest in verse-forms, he noticed these two poems particularly. At any rate, regardless of specific influence, they show that attempts at a nine-line stanza had been made before Spenser's time.

Curiously enough, the *Shepherd's Calendar*, that store-house of Spenser's early experiments, contains no attempts at a nine-line stanza, nor do we find any eight-line stanzas of the madrigal type cited by Miss Pope. What we do find is a certain amount of experiment in the use of a medial *b* rime couplet in stanzas of eight and ten

* *The Critical Background of the Spenserian Stanza*, *Mod. Phil.*, 24. 31.

† See Arber's Reprint, p. 166.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 188.

lines. This idea almost certainly came to him from the similar couplet in the rime royal of his beloved Chaucer, but here we see him beginning to adapt it to his own uses. In "June" we find the eight-line stanza *ababbaba*, in regular pentameter; and in "November" we find the scheme *ababbccdbd*, the first five lines pentameter and the rest varying long and short lines. In both cases we see the *bb* couplet of rime royal turned to account in stanzas of different sorts.

It is thus evident that two of the three peculiarities of Spenser's stanza, namely, the medial couplet and the final couplet, may have come to him from native sources, aided by his own ingenuity. The third, the linking of the final couplet with the rest of the stanza, must, I believe, be unequivocally credited to the Italian madrigal, if to any source outside of the poet's own invention. I have no theory to propound for the origin of the Spenserian stanza. Like every other great poetic form, it had many origins. No one will deny that Miss Pope is right in seeing some of them in Italy, but Chaucer and the unknown experimenters in the age of Wyatt and Surrey must receive their share too. The two nine-line stanzas in *Tottel's Miscellany* are too like Spenser and too unlike any of the madrigals given by Miss Pope to be entirely without significance.

LEICESTER BRADNER.

TURRETS IN EARLY ELIZABETHAN THEATRES

RELATIVE to Dr. Allison Gaw's conclusion that "a number of considerations point to the likelihood that the first turret in an Elizabethan theatre was built in the Rose early in 1592 at the direct order of Strange's men under the leadership of Edward Alleyn,"* it is advisable that scholars should duly weigh Stubbes' statement in *The Anatomy of Abuses* (1583), concerning the earthquake experienced in London on April 6, 1580, at a time when there were only two public theatres and those both in Holywell. After pointing to "the fearful judgment of God" upon those who had recently visited the Bear Garden on a Sunday and had been victims of a dreadful accident, Stubbes goes on to say :

* *The Origin and Development of "1 Henry VI" in Relation to Shakespeare, Marlowe, Peele and Greene*, as cited in Mr. H. Dugdale Sykes's review in *R.E.S.*, iv, 101.

The like judgment almost did the Lord show unto them a little before, being assembled at their theatres to see their bawdy interludes and other trumperies practised, for He caused the earth mightily to shake and quaver, as though all would have fallen down ; whereat the people, sore amazed, some leapt down from the top of the turrets, pinnacles and towers where they stood, to the ground, whereof some had their legs broke, some their arms, some their backs, some hurt one where, some another, and many score crushed and bruised.*

It is noteworthy that Stubbes, in describing the accident at the Bear Garden on January 13, 1583, makes no reference to turrets, pinnacles or towers, but says the spectators were " mounted aloft upon their scaffolds and galleries." There must certainly have been some towers or turrets surmounting the Theatre and the Curtain and plainly visible to the eye to warrant such a statement. It is hardly likely that Stubbes ever visited any playhouse.

W. J. LAWRENCE.

A POINT IN THE GEOGRAPHY OF SHAKESPEARE

IN Shakespeare's *King John*, Act I., Scene i, ll. 202 and 203 read as follows :

And talking of the Alps and Apennines,
The Pyrenean and the river Po, . . .

This is part of a speech by the Bastard, and " the Pyrenean " is usually interpreted as the Pyrenees. At first sight this seems to be the obvious explanation ; but there is possibly another interpretation of Pyrenean which is worthy of attention. This interpretation would explain its appearance in such close association with " Alps," " Apennines," and " River Po."

In mediæval writers we frequently find " Pyreneus " used, not in reference to the Pyrenees, but to the Alps. Thus, in Otto of Freising's *Gesta Friderici*, Imp. II., c. 13, the following occurs in a description of Italy :

Habens a septentrionem Pyreneas, ut dictum est, Alpes, ab austro Apenninum.†

* *The Anatomy of Abuses*, edit. Furnivall, p. 179. For other accounts of the panic in the theatres, see Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, 11th edit. 1907, i, p. 369 ; Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, iv, p. 208.

† Ed. Waitz, p. 114 ; and cf. *ibid.* p. 115.

There are other examples in Otto's writings. Thus, in his *Chronicle*, Bk. VII., ch. xvii., we read :

Porro Conradus a fratre et quibusdam aliis rex creatus Pyreneum per iugum Septimi montis, qua Rhenus et Enus fluvii oriuntur, transcendit.*

Whilst in the same work (vii. 14) we have :

Per montem Iovis Pyreneum transit ac in plano Italiæ residens iuxta Padum militem recensuit.†

Moreover, in the *Chronicle* of Otto of St. Blasius, the word "Pyreneus" is used in reference to the Apennines. For example, in c. 52 there is a description of Otto IV's expedition into Italy in 1209. Having crossed the Brenner and having moved to Milan, Otto then

Pyreneumque transiens Tusciam applicuit.‡

And the same author was most likely referring to the Apennines in c. 43, where he says :

Fridrico . . . contracto exercitu tercia vice Italiam intravit ac Pyreneum transiens cunctaque in Tuscia et in Campania pro libitu disponens in Apuliam et Calabriam divertit.§

There are admittedly plenty of references in these and other mediæval chronicles where the word "Pyreneus" is definitely used in connection with the Pyrenees proper. || But there can also be no doubt that it was used to indicate the Alps. Nor can this have been simply due to confusion of the two ranges. Otto of Freising seems to have prided himself on his geographical knowledge ; and the roads through the Alps were well known during the Middle Ages. They were constantly being used for imperial expeditions into Italy. They were also used by merchants moving to and from the markets of the Low Countries and South Germany ; and by pilgrims visiting the Holy Places of Italy, or finding their way to the Mediterranean seaboard to take ship for the Holy Land itself.

The problem of this use of the word "Pyreneus" for the Alps was touched on by Josias Simler ¶ in his *De Alpibus Commentarius*.

* Ed. Hofmeister, p. 334. Conrad crossed by the Septimer Pass.

† *Ibid.* p. 325. The "Mount of Jove" was the usual mediæval name for the Great St. Bernard Pass.

‡ Ed. Hofmeister, p. 87 ; and cf. Otto of Freis. *Gesta*, p. 115.

§ Ed. Hofmeister, p. 69.

|| Amongst many others, see Einhard *Vita Karoli*, 6th ed., ed. Pertz, pp. 12 and 18.

¶ 1530-1576. References to Simler are to the edition published by W. A. B. Coolidge, *Josias Simler et les Origines de l'Alpinisme*, Grenoble, 1904.

This book, published in 1574, is a detailed description of the Alps both topographical and historical. In the section which he devotes to the name of the Alps, Simler says :

Quidam etiam quosvis altissimos montes Alpes nominant, atque hoc modo Pyrenei montes, qui Hispaniam a Gallia dividunt, Alpes nominantur a Procopio libro primo. Contra Frisingensis Otto Alpes nominat Pyreneum, "Italiam" scribens "a Septentrione habere Pyreneas Alpes." Guntherus in Ligurino "Pyreneum" inquit "complexi Alpes et Apenninum, atque has esse Pyrenei partes." Sed nos sequemur veterum sententiam qui montes Italiam terminantes Alpes proprie nominant.*

Later in his book, Simler also refers to the Brenner as the road

"quem quidam Pyreneum vocant." †

From this it seems likely that the name "Pyreneus" was often applied to the Alps, sometimes also to the Apennines, if indeed both the latter were not regarded as forming one huge "Pyrenean" chain.

In his note ‡ on these passages in Simler, Coolidge brings forward the suggestion that the name "Pyreneus" was applied to the Alps in general through a vague memory of the word "Peninus" which was the special name applied to the highest portion of the Alpine chain. Further, he mentions that Tschudi, § who also wrote on the Alps in the sixteenth century, refers on p. 333 of his *Gallia Comata* to the Bernina Pass || as "Mons Pyreneus."

If the term was still in use in the sixteenth century (even though such an authority as Simler preferred the more distinctive name), it may be possible that in the lines taken above from *King John*, "Pyrenean" does not refer to the Pyrenees proper but simply to the Alps. The Bastard, in the speech from which the lines in question are taken, is poking fun at the courtly conversation affected by travellers; and the Elizabethan gallant (of whom, no doubt, Shakespeare was thinking when he wrote the lines) was more likely to be acquainted with the Alps which he crossed to become an "Englishman Italianate," than he was with the Pyrenees.

J. E. TYLER.

* Ed. Coolidge, p. 18.

† *Ibid.* p. 194.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 13*.

§ Of Glarus, 1505-1572.

|| Between the Engadine and the Valtelline.

THE "POET MARSTON" LETTER TO SIR GERVASE
CLIFTON, 1607

IN *R.E.S.*, Notes and Observations (1928, vol. 4, p. 86), Mr. W. H. Grattan Flood causes to be reprinted (with, I believe, only two small variations of a comma and a mis-spelling) a letter first printed in the Historical Manuscripts Commission's *Report on Manuscripts in Various Collections* (vol. 7, p. 389). This letter is now, presumably, in the possession of Lt.-Col. Clifton, of Clifton Hall, Nottingham.

Mr. Grattan Flood says that the letter "seems, somehow, to have escaped the notice" of Marston's biographers. It only came to light in 1914; it is referred to by Sir Edmund Chambers (*Elizabethan Stage*, vol. 3, p. 429), and again by Dr. Greg (*English Literary Autographs*, pt. 1, s. 18).

From internal evidence—and the evidence given is very meagre—Mr. Grattan Flood dates the letter *c.* 1614 or 1615. Sir Edmund states that the letter "must, from the names used, be of 1603–1608," but he gives no evidence for either of his limiting dates. I think that a careful examination dates the letter in August 1607, certainly later than July 1603 and most probably earlier than September 1607.

The letter, undated and unsigned, is endorsed "Poet Marston." It is addressed to Sir Gervase Clifton and makes mention of Sir John Harper, Lord Spencer, and "my Lady Dorithy."

Gervase or William Clifton was made a Knight of the Bath on the coronation of James I., July 25, 1603 (Shaw, *Knights of England*, 1906, vol. 1, p. 154). He died in 1666 and was attended in his last illness by Robert Thoroton, "Doctor of Physick," who left an account of him (see Thoroton, *Antiquities of Nottinghamshire*, 1677, pp. 55, 57; Nichols, *Progresses of James I.*, 1828, vol. 1, p. 85, n. 2, and elsewhere).

John Harper of Derbyshire was dubbed knight by the King at Worksop on April 21, 1603—not in 1605, as Mr. Grattan Flood states. Harper died in 1622 (Shaw, *Knights*, vol. 2, p. 102; Nichols, *v.s.*, p. 88 n.).

Sir Robert Spencer, of Wormleighton, Warwickshire, and of Althorp in Brington, Northamptonshire, was created Baron Spencer of Wormleighton on July 21, 1603. He died in 1627 (*D.N.B.* article; G.E.C., *Complete Peerage*, vol. 7 (1896), p. 205).

The only Lady "Dorithy" I can find, connected with the above

names, is a remote relation of Lord Spencer and the grandmother of Henry (Hastings), Earl of Huntingdon. Sir Robert Spencer was the only son of a Sir John Spencer who died in 1600, and the great-great-grandson of a Sir John Spencer who died in 1522. There was another Sir John Spencer (who died in 1586) who was also a great-grandson of the 1522 Spencer. This 1586 Spencer had among his daughters, Alice, who married as her first husband, Ferdinando (Stanley), Earl of Derby. Elizabeth, the third and youngest daughter of this marriage, married in 1601, Henry (Hastings), grandson and heir of George (Hastings), Earl of Huntingdon. George, Earl of Huntingdon, had married in 1557, DOROTHY, the second daughter and co-heiress of Sir John Port, of Etwall, Derbyshire. This Earl of Huntingdon died in December 1604, his grandson succeeding to the title; his widow died on September 2, 1607. (*The Complete Peerage*, by G.E.C., revised and much enlarged by the Hon. Vicary Gibbs, now edited by H. A. Doubleday Duncan Warrand and Lord Howard de Walden, vol. 6 (1926), pp. 657-658—on the Huntingdons. See also vol. 5 (1916), pp. 212-213 and 212 *n. f.*, for Derby.)

It is obvious that the Marston letter cannot be earlier than July 1603; and if the above identification of "my Lady Dorithy" be accepted, it cannot be later than the end of August 1607.

But the date may be given with greater precision. The letter is one of excuse for Marston's delay in sending to Sir Gervase a promised copy of "the booke." Other copies which Marston had had made were "given and stolne" from him at Lord Spencer's; but he had given his own copy to a scrivener who would soon have completed another.

I make little doubt that the "booke" was a copy of Marston's Ashby Entertainment, given by the Earl and Countess of Huntingdon for "their" mother Alice, Countess Dowager of Derby. This identification follows easily from the other identification of "my Lady Dorithy" as the Earl of Huntingdon's grandmother. Ferdinando, Earl of Derby, died in April 1594, and his widow in 1600 married Thomas (Egerton), first Viscount Brackley—better known as Lord Chancellor Ellesmere—who died in 1617; the Lady Alice died in 1637. Elizabeth, the Earl of Derby's daughter, was not Countess of Huntingdon until after the death of her husband's grandfather on December 30, 1604; her husband's grandmother was still alive in August 1607 when the Ashby Entertainment was

given. As for the references in the letter to "my Lord Spencer's" and "Sir John Harper's"—these may refer to their London establishments; but the Huntingdon entertainment at Ashby-de-la-Zouch would be of very great interest to friendly families in the nearby counties of Derbyshire and Warwickshire. Ashby is only sixteen miles from Clifton.

It seems very probable that "Poet" Marston's letter to Sir Gervase Clifton, concerning a copy of the Ashby Entertainment, was written some time in August 1607 later than the visit of the dowager-Countess and before the death of the Earl of Huntingdon's grandmother, Dorothy, on September 2.

Note.—I can find no mention of any such "booke" in the Report on the Clifton manuscripts. Lt.-Col. Clifton has very kindly promised me the loan of the letter, when it can be found, for photographing and for comparison with other specimens of Marston's handwriting. The Clifton manuscripts are at present being rearranged and some few have been misplaced.

Other notes and observations on the Clifton Letter and the Ashby Entertainment may fittingly wait until the appearance of the collected edition of Marston that I am preparing.

ROBERT E. BRETTE.

TWO MORE UNDESCRIBED MSS. OF JOHN DONNE'S POEMS

(1) BRITISH MUSEUM HARLEIAN COLLECTION 3998

FOLIOS 154-167 of this MS. contain a poem *Metempsychosis* which is catalogued as being by Edward Smith, whose name occurs on f. 154 and f. 167. The poem is Donne's *Progresse of the Soule*. Edward Smith is probably the name of a professional copyist, for it occurs again in a Donne MS. in University Library, Cambridge, which Grierson designated C (MS. Add. 29, f. 8.)

The Progresse of the Soule is a satire written for a small and select audience and never intended by its author for publication. Its text is therefore difficult to settle. In Vol. iii, No. 11 of this review I suggested, by a comparison of that MS. and that text, that Add. MS. 5778 in University Library, Cambridge, was a MS. of that type from which the 1633 edition was printed. Harl. 3998

gives some completely new readings—which may represent an early version of the poem. Stanza lii, which does not occur in this MS., may well have been added by Donne in order that some sort of finishing touch might be given to what is really only a fragment of a satire, and that too severe a judgment might not be passed upon that band of heretics of which Queen Elizabeth was to be last and greatest.

most of those arts, whence our lives are blest
By cursed Cain's race invented be.

Minor unimportant variations are not given in the following list, and Grierson's text is used for purposes of comparison.

- l. 56. streights and lands (Grsn.), sands & straigh [MS. is torn here].
- l. 65. straine (Grsn.), chaine (MS.).
- l. 77. stood (Grsn.), stockt (MS.).
- l. 87. her (Grsn.), whose (MS.).
- l. 94. us, Rivolets (Grsn.), y^e Rivolets (MS.).
- l. 119. perfects (Grsn.), profitts (MS.).
- l. 129. Plot (Grsn.), Pitt (MS.).
- l. 133. fleets (Grsn.), flotes (MS.).
- l. 137. and have so fill'd (Grsn.), so filled is the way (MS.).
- l. 177. enjayld (Grsn.), exhal'd (MS.).
- l. 180. pick'd (Grsn.), pok'd (MS.).
- l. 195. tast (Grsn.), last (MS.).
- l. 321 : He hunts not fish, But as a favourite
 Lies still at Court, and is himself a nett
 Where Sutors. . . . (MS.).
- l. 330. That thousands guiltles small to make one great must dye (MS.).
- l. 345. outstreat (Grsn.), out sweat (MS.).
- l. 358. So weareth one, his sword y^e other plies (MS.).
- l. 383. . . . who had been King, but y^t too wise
 Hee was, just, thankfull, loth t'offend (MS.).
- l. 399. And thus he made him for his praye and Toombe (MS.).
- l. 418. Nor <make> resist (Grsn.), Now much resist (MS.).
- l. 427. ends (Grsn.), ended (MS.).
- l. 432. Emperours (Grsn.), Princes (MS.).
- l. 456. He wonders. Much with all (Grsn.), Hee wonders, much : wth all (MS.).
- l. 466. hoiting (Grsn.), hoisting (MS.); bones (Grsn.), howse (MS.).
- l. 467. To make his mistresse merry (Grsn.), And uplifts softly (MS.).
- l. 485. <loth> (Grsn.), loth (MS.). [Neither 1633 nor 1669 nor any other MS. gives this, the obviously correct reading.]

(2) DOBELL MS.

This MS., to which reference was made at the end of the article in *R.E.S.*, Oct. 1927, is a beautifully bound and written book now in the possession of Messrs. Dobell, to whose kindness in allowing me to examine it I am indebted. It includes specimens of every literary form which Donne attempted—letters, characters, paradoxes,

sermons, love-songs, divine poems, satires, elegies, epistles—and has therefore presumably been compiled for some seventeenth-century collector who desired to have a good selection of the poet's work. Certain poems, e.g. *Absence heare thou my protestation*, *Love bred of glances*, and *True love finds wit*, which are certainly not by John Donne, are included, and thus the weight which can be placed upon readings in this MS. is diminished. Among the more interesting readings of this MS. are :

The Litanie, l. 5. And by selfe murder, red (Grsn.), and by myselfe murdered (Dobell MS.).

Holy Sonnets, XVI., l. 11. ; but all healing grace and spirit
Revive againe what law and letter kill (Grsn.).
let thy all healing grace
Revive and quicken (Dobell MS.).

The copyist of this MS. has probably had before him at one period a MS. of the type D, H₄₉, Lec, at another one of the type, S₉₆W.

H. J. L. ROBBIE.

CORRESPONDENCE

CHAUCER'S PENSIONS IN APRIL, 1385 *

SIR,

It is usual in quoting, as well as in reprinting, to take the text of the latest edition an author has revised, not that of the first edition. I am under the impression that the date April 20 for Chaucer's receipt of his pension in 1385 was not of my own invention. In any case, certainly, in the edition of my Chaucer Primer of 1912 and all subsequent to it, and, I think, in two, if not all three of the editions between 1893 and 1912, for the passage Dr. Wyatt quotes there is substituted :

We know, however, that in 1385 Chaucer received his pensions personally on April 24, and to do this he must have started back from Canterbury the day after his arrival and called in at the Treasury on his way home. Even if his journey had proved expensive, this seems rather hasty work.

Dr. Wyatt might have spared himself a visit to the Record Office, and the *Review* a page of print, if it had occurred to him to look at the current edition of my little Primer.

ALFRED W. POLLARD.

* R.E.S., iv, 83.

REVIEWS

Some New Light on Chaucer. By JOHN MATTHEWS MANLY.
1926. New York: Henry Holt & Co. Pp. xiv+305. \$2.50.

PROFESSOR MANLY'S important volume makes available the substance of a course of lectures he gave at Harvard in 1924. He has kept the form and pleasant atmosphere of the lecture theatre, and except for the introduction of fresh illustrative material here and there, the book reproduces the lectures. His title is well chosen; for he has scattered light over a wide field of Chaucerian problems. One might even go so far as to say he has revealed Chaucer to us afresh and in a new light.

To the present writer it appears that the most important questions to ask about Professor Manly's book are what his theory or working hypothesis is, and whether he has justified it. His theory is that behind Chaucer's "most vital and successful sketches lay the observation of living men and women," and that if some at least of the definite statements he made about these men and women are true the searching of the records of his time ought to discover persons answering accurately or nearly so to the descriptions he gave of them. Professor Manly does not put his claim too high; but high enough to warrant a hopeful search for confirmation. The hypothesis, I believe, he has substantially established. He has provided us with so considerable a body of evidence illustrating his thesis that one does not hesitate to applaud his method as being fruitful. He has already justified the search in the records of Chaucer's time for "persons answering accurately or nearly so to the descriptions he gave of them."

The alternative to Professor Manly's hypothesis is that Chaucer only had his eye on types; that he did not portray identifiable or recognisable individuals. But if we consider the limited circle of Chaucer's readers and audience, and consider further how slowly copies of his *Prologue* and *Canterbury Tales* must have circulated outside that circle, is it not more likely that he would

describe men and women his audience would recognise—as More does in his *Comfort in Tribulation* or Erasmus in his *Colloquies*—than such types or composite studies as we associate with the Characters of an Earle or Overbury or the humours of the comedy of Ben Jonson? These were a product of the Renaissance and the wider circulation of the printed book.

He begins by reconstructing Chaucer's life from the extant data, and at once scores by the use he makes of the testimony of William Buckley, Benchler and keeper of the archives of the Inner Temple, that Chaucer was a member of the Inn. He finds a useful account in Fortescue of the education of a law apprentice, and argues that Chaucer's official career was one for which he had been trained and not a series of rewards for his poetry. He shows the Chaucers as a well-to-do family, engaged in business and in the public service; and by his close inquiries into their marriages and alliances he succeeds in drawing a fairly definite Chaucer circle. Against this background he sets to work on the problem of the identification of such characters in the *Prologue* and *Tales* as lend themselves to an inquiry of this kind.

Thus Harry Bailly, innkeeper of Southwark, has survived in seven records, in one of which his wife is named:

Henricus Bailiff, Ostyler, Christian Uxor eius—ij^a.

If this Southwark subsidy roll had read *Godelief* for *Christian* the identification would have been secured doubly.

The problem of the Reeve is approached *via* Baldeswell, which points Professor Manly to the affairs of the young heir of the Pembrokes, affairs with which Chaucer himself was associated as a surety or mainpernour. The description of his dwelling seems to be that of a man who has seen it or heard of it in depositions.

His woning was ful fair upon an heeth
With grenē treēs shadowed was his place.

It is, however, interesting to note that while the affair of the suretyship was afoot, Chaucer was granted permission to employ a deputy for four months (1383), "as he is like to be so much occupied upon particular business." A feud connects the Miller with the Reeve; and the miller of the Reeve's Tale is too closely akin to the miller of the Prologue to escape question. He is therefore treated as an example of portraiture, and the striking picture of the "millers wife of Trumpington" is emphasised.

Another feud—that of the Summoner and the Friar—is associated with a district not less distinctive than Baldeswell; “the mersshy contree called Holdernessee.” This locality was known well to some of Chaucer’s friends, two of whom at least, Canons of Beverley, were his associates, and eminent in the king’s service. Particularly interesting here is the occurrence in the Friar’s and Summoner’s Tales of similar dialectal peculiarities of the north. One must also add that throughout it is an essential element in the main argument that the ground should be explored to show why Chaucer’s audience should be interested in his topical and personal hits.

The Shipman is approached as master of the Maudelayne of Dartmouth. The public standing of John Hawley of Dartmouth, king’s escheator for Devon and Cornwall, and leader of the pirate-mariners of the West Country, whose fine tomb may be seen to-day in the parish church, is attested by many extant records. These include references to his master mariners, amongst whom was one, Peter Risshenden, master of the Maudelayne. As witnesses in Hawley’s defence in any of the legal actions taken against the piratical activities of his chief, the Justice of Peace for Devon, such men as Risshenden must have interested Chaucer’s legal friends. I venture to think that it was as a witness that Chaucer’s Shipman came to be known to the Chaucer circle. The Merchant divides a chapter with the Shipman, piracy being the link; and one learns much that is fresh of the “keeping of the sea,” the relations of the English Merchants with Bruges and Middleburg, of the reference to Orwell and the history of the Merchant Adventurers.

Equally suggestive are the chapters on the Prioress, the Nun’s Priest, the Wife of Bath, and the Canon and his Yeoman. That Madam Eglentyne may be identified with the Domina Argentyne of St. Leonard’s convent at Bow justifies a further search, in which the name of her priest, the curate of St. Leonard’s parish church, may also be disclosed. One of Professor Manly’s prettiest points is to show that the phrase “besyde Bathe” used of the Wife of Bath indicates the suburb or parish of St. Michaels—without the North Gate, otherwise described as *juxta Bathon*.

Finally, one ought to note that there is reason to remark that the alchemist of the Canon Yeoman’s Tale and the swindler who overtakes the pilgrims are not only both canons, but that Chaucer and his audience may have had in mind a Canon of Windsor, William

Shuchirch, a teacher of alchemy. Professor Manly suggests that Chaucer himself had been bitten. His references to alchemists and their ways are unusually bitter.

Such, in brief, are the lines that Professor Manly is following; and there seems to me to be little doubt that he is achieving significant results. Dr. McKerrow has kindly allowed me to read Miss Wood-Legh's careful and valuable examination of Professor Manly's identification of the Franklin with John Bussy.* It is possible that Stephen de Hales and not John Bussy is the man, although territorially Manly has made out a good case for the association of Bussy with the Sergeant (Pynchbek).† What most impresses me, however, in Chaucer's picture of the Franklin is its portraiture. It is as distinctive as that of the Reeve, the Wife of Bath or the Prioress. These do not lead me to think of classes and types but of individuals. It may be that here we have a fundamental difference of attitude between history and literature. Miss Wood-Legh has her eye on the typical man of affairs in the government of the shire, Professor Manly on a portrait. The essential question is whether Professor Manly is pursuing a mirage, looking for individuals and definite localities where all is composite and typical; or has he a sound working hypothesis? Miss Wood-Legh does not go so far as to suggest that the hypothesis will not work; Professor Manly has shown, I believe, that it is already fruitful, and that it will repay the labour that all of us hope he may long be able to devote to it.

A. W. REED.

Floris and Blancheflour. A Middle English Romance. Ed. from the Trentham and Auchinleck MSS. by A. B. TAYLOR, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1927. Pp. 108. 4s. 6d.

It is good to have *Floris and Blancheflour* in this readable form. If the Middle-English romances are to be read and appreciated as literature, texts such as this must be provided—based on a study of the manuscripts and yet not overweighted with critical apparatus. Professor Taylor is to be thanked for having produced for the general

* See pp. 145-151 above.

† Prof. Manly, I note, appears to misread the line—

"In termēs hadde he caas and doomēs alle;"

which means *not* that he could quote them *but* that he had a collection of Year Books containing them, arranged in Terms, *i.e.* Hilary, Easter, Trinity, and Michaelmas.

reader a comprehensible version of one of the most attractive of the romances, and the Clarendon Press should be congratulated for its foresight in planning the series in which the romance now appears.

Neither of the two editions of the last fifty years serves the purpose of the present one. Hausknecht's critical text of 1885 and the Early English Text Society's careful reproduction of three of the manuscripts are intended for those who are interested in the appearance of the manuscripts and who wish to understand the relations between them, and they are still indispensable. It must not be assumed that Professor Taylor's edition has no uses for the student of manuscripts. Hausknecht, in his discussion of them, shows that there is little to choose between MS. Cambridge Gg. 4. 27. 2 (C), which he and the E.E.T.S. editor make the basis of their texts, and the Auchinleck MS. (A), chiefly used by Professor Taylor. There is no recent or reliable reproduction of the latter and it is useful to have Professor Taylor's, though it might have been made even more useful than it is.

The editor's alterations of the Auchinleck readings are, as he explains, for the sake of the sense or the rhyme. An instance of one that is well justified is in l. 206, where the manuscript reading *garysoun* is altered to *garsome* and a good note illustrates the use and meaning of the phrase "gold and garsome." Many of the alterations are suggested either by the French poem or by the readings of other manuscripts of the English. Often skilful reconstructions of the Auchinleck text are effected by the acknowledged use of other manuscript readings, but there is a good deal of inconsistency in the use of them. Sometimes they are not used when they might be, or, if they are used, mention is not made of the fact. The following are some instances :

l. 528, MS. *had* is altered to *hap*, but it is not noted that the Trentham MS. (T.) has *hap* here and C. has *haz* (= *hap*). On the other hand, in connection with the same alteration in l. 543, the reading *hap* is quoted from C.

l. 565, MS. *inome* (not recorded, like most altered readings from A, in the footnotes, but mentioned in the notes at the end of the text) is changed to *icome* and a note explains that the latter fits the sense and grammar better. It is not noted that Cott. Vitell. D. III (V) has the reading *icome*.

l. 569, MS. *daye* is altered to *dayre* for the sake of the rhyme, but no reference is made to the readings *doyre* and *Darys* of V and T

which give credibility to the suggestion, nor is acknowledgment made to Hausknecht who first gave *Dayre* as the correct reading.

ll. 624-5, MS. *Nis no dai pourz þe zer þat scheping nis þeinne* (Hausknecht reads *þerinne*) *plener* obviously needs some alteration in the second line for the sake of the rhythm. Professor Taylor defends *ferre* against *scheping* (*chepyng* in T) on the grounds that the French version has *foire*, and he alters *þat* to *þe* and *þeinne* to *þer iliche*, but keeps the A reading in the first line. A still closer adherence to the French (*A toutes est la foire plaine En tous les jours de la semaine*) would probably lead him to adopt completely the reading in C, *Eche day in al þe zere þe feire is þer iliche plener*, instead of adopting it in part and in part keeping the reading of A.

In a few lines it would seem better to preserve the reading of A unaltered. For instance, in l. 713, MS. *zelle* is supported by T and makes good sense, and though it is possible, judging from the French, that *welme* was written by the English poet, still it is not certain. Another alteration which arouses some doubt is that of MS. *sigge* to *segge* to rhyme with MS. *begge* in l. 1171. *Sygge* is the reading of T, where it rhymes correctly with *bygge*, and it is therefore just possible that it is *begge* that should be changed in A, not *sigge*. Against this suggestion is the fact that in ll. 1121-2 MS. *sigge* rhymes with *allegge* (T. *sygge*, *legge*), and though *sigge* is not out of place in a S.E. Midland poem, there seems no evidence for a form *alligge*, *ligge* (of French origin). It is therefore not possible to condemn Professor Taylor's alteration of *sigge*, but surely the matter merited discussion somewhere in his book? Instead of discussing it, he assumes its correctness and uses the rhyming word *begge* as an argument for the change of O.E. *y* to *e* in his note to l. 273 and again on p. 90.

It is sometimes difficult to discover the exact reading of the Auchinleck MS. from this edition because several methods of indicating manuscript readings are used in it. Two distinct methods appear, for instance, in connection with ll. 1259 and 1282, and a third has already been mentioned in connection with l. 565.

The notes at the end of the text are for the most part both useful and interesting, and are wisely concerned mainly with other aspects than the purely linguistic. In one linguistic note the editor appears to have overlooked forms in other Middle English poems. Commenting on ll. 893-4, he declares that the rhyme of *fluzte* or *flizte* (MS. spelling *fluste*) with *wiste* is impossible. But the rhyme of

Kryst with *myste* (O.E. *miht*) in the *Pearl*, ll. 458 and 462, is surely similar, and at least two editors, Gollancz in his edition of *Pearl*, and Mr. Sisam, in the Appendix on the English Language in the Fourteenth Century (*Fourteenth Century Verse and Prose*, p. 278), comment on the change in the sound of O.E. *h* which makes it possible.

Most linguistic matters are relegated to a special Note on the Language, pp. 89 ff. There is one linguistic feature of the poem which needs more discussion than it is given there. On p. 90 Professor Taylor gives *e* as a development of O.E. *y* in this poem, and refers back to his note on l. 273, where several examples of this change are given. It has already been shown that one example (the rhyme of *begge* : *segge*, ll. 1171-2) is inconclusive. The rhyme *rene* : *clene* is also inconclusive, and the remarks that are made about *rene* seem to show some confusion. In the note on l. 273 the word is given as an example of the South-Eastern development of *y* to *e*, while on p. 90 it is used as an example of the change of *y*, lengthened in open syllables, to *ē*. If it shows the South-Eastern development, lengthening in open syllables would surely result in *ē* (slack) (cf. Jordan, *Handbuch der mitttelenglischen Grammatik*, § 40, 2; Luick, *Historische Grammatik*, p. 399). On the other hand, if it shows *ē* (tense), as Professor Taylor states, the development must have been *y* > *i* (unrounded) > *ē* (cf. Jordan, *Handbuch*, § 36, 3; Luick, *Historische Grammatik*, § 393), and the word is then no proof of a South-Eastern change from *ȳ* to *ē*. The rhyming word *clene* does not help, since O.E. *æ*² could appear in the South-East Midlands as either *ē* or *ē* (cf. Wyld, *South-Eastern and South-East Midland Dialects in Middle English, Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, vol. vi, p. 128, O.E. *æ*²).

This leaves *kesse* rhyming with *hostesse* as the only example in the note on l. 273. A further list of examples of the change *ȳ* > *ē* is given on p. 90. Of these only *trest* is a rhyming word, and one cannot therefore be absolutely certain of the value of the others. Since the origin of *trest* is given in the glossary as " ? O.E. *trystan*," it too is somewhat of a broken reed. While there is no good reason for contradicting Professor Taylor's view that O.E. *y* does appear as *e* in the dialect of the poem, still the evidence he brings forward is mostly of such an inconclusive nature that his brief summary of the matter is very misleading.

The criticisms that have been made reveal the faults of this

edition from the point of view of the student of Middle English manuscripts and Middle English language. For the student of literature, for whom it is to be presumed it was chiefly intended, it is admirable. Perhaps it is unfair to complain that it was not made to appeal to the former class of readers also, but a very little more care in detail would have effected this. Careful study of Professor Taylor's treatment of the text, for instance, reveals that he often deserves more confidence than he appears to do or than he will probably receive. Sometimes a mere reference to another manuscript would show the basis for an apparently new and unfounded textual emendation, and so disperse the suspicions of the reader.

DOROTHY EVERETT.

The Wandering Scholars. By HELEN WADDELL. London: Constable & Co., Ltd. 1927. Pp. xxviii+292. 21s. net.

THE subject of this book cannot be said to be of much direct concern to the student of English Literature, save in so far as anything which by comparison or contrast throws a light on the literature of his own country concerns him, for the influence of the "Wandering Scholars" of the Continent seems here to have been singularly little; but nevertheless it is a book which English students would find well worth reading, if only as a corrective to the view of the "Dark" or Early Middle Ages which is still to be found in many text-books. It admirably illustrates the revolution which has taken place in literary history within the present century, a revolution which I doubt if we all fully recognise. Each of us, in his own particular small section of the field, is no doubt aware how almost everything which in our younger days was taken as axiomatic has been questioned or disproved, and how the newer generation of students is looking on the "facts" that remain from an altogether different angle from that from which we regarded them, keenly interested in much that we ignored and holding of small account much that once seemed of supreme importance. But in "literary history" as a whole the change has been still more remarkable. Not twenty years ago one could, with security and an easy conscience, divide literature since the birth of Christ into a number of "periods" each easily characterised in a few lines. There was the later classical period, the Dark Ages, which were merely full of darkness and did not

matter, the (later) Middle Ages characterised by a new kind of romance sprung partly from popular legend and partly from a misunderstanding of the classics, the Renaissance which began with the dispersal of Greek scholars at the fall of Constantinople in 1453, and so on to the dull and heavy eighteenth century and the rise of the Romantic Period at its end. There is, no doubt, some use in such divisions, and they are still recognised and taught, but in a very different spirit from that in which they were taught to us, rather indeed as a convenient fiction than as representing sober fact. Our interest now lies, not in inventing neat phrases which will serve to label these periods and emphasise the watertight nature of their divisions, but in showing how they are interlocked one with another, how the lyrical and dramatic impulse, the spirit of adventure, of jesting and of romance permeated and are exhibited at all periods, and how in all places and at all times the spirit of literature is one. As we know now, there was much classical learning before the fall of Constantinople, and even in the Dark Ages themselves there were wit and poetry and eloquence and philosophy, and all the essence of human loves and sorrows in as great measure as at any other period, although political circumstances and the difficulties of communication did indeed prevent a literary development comparable with those of later times.

The book before us is an exemplification of this modern trend of critical inquiry, and in this lies its merit, I think even more than in the actual account of the *Wandering Scholars* which occupies a comparatively small part of it; for all the earlier portion is devoted to showing how much of intellectual life and liveliness there was in those ages which we have been accustomed to dismiss as dull and ignorant. Its thesis indeed recalls the excellent address with which Professor E. K. Rand inaugurated the proceedings of the recently founded *Mediaeval Academy of America*, a body which with its membership of over 800 is surely a sufficient refutation of the statement on the dust cover of the book before us that "*Mediaeval Latin is a forgotten language; its literature an unexploited country.*" This preliminary portion, which occupies a large part of the volume, is really a history of *Mediaeval Latin literature* in its popular and especially lyrical aspects, written with immense enthusiasm and obviously inspired by a thorough first-hand knowledge of the subject.

That Miss Waddell has written an altogether satisfactory book

cannot, I fear, be maintained. It reminds one too forcibly of the lectures of certain "brilliant" university professors, which, crammed to overflowing with famous names and happy quotations, are apt to fill the students with a vague, and often transient, enthusiasm for the lecturer and his subject without adding appreciably to their knowledge. Her very wide reading has enabled her to pack so many allusions of all sorts, literary and even political, into her book, with a view apparently of making it picturesque, that in parts the drift of her argument is by no means easy to follow. She passes from one subject to another at the beck of a quotation or a story (and often these are in themselves most happily chosen and much to the point), but writing of this kind makes hard reading, for it demands in the reader a knowledge almost equal to that of the writer. I suppose that I ought not to hesitate over the statement (p. 45) that Theodulfus described the Irish scholars at Charlemagne's court "in verses which anticipate the language of the *Morning Post*," or wonder what exactly is implied by the statement that Abelard "stamped himself on the imagination of the [twelfth] century in a fashion beside which Petrarch's influence on the sixteenth becomes the nice conduct of a clouded *cane*" (p. 107), but even though one can perhaps guess at the author's meaning in both places, surely they are very tiresome ways of expressing quite simple ideas.

But besides this fondness for somewhat obscure allusions, Miss Waddell's style suffers from a curiously lax use of personal pronouns. It is frequently necessary to refer to the footnotes in order to make sure of the person to whom she refers. Even on p. 2 it is difficult to make out whether certain quotations are from Ausonius or Paulinus, and I do not think that she ought to have allowed such passages as the following to pass :

Damian is the greatest name in the century : the next greatest are, like him, Italian, though they made their name in France, Lanfranc, who came from the law school of Pavia to Bec in Normandy, and thence with the Conqueror to Canterbury : Fulbert, Chancellor and Bishop of Chartres. He was born in Rome, about 960 ; for . . . (p. 87).

Marbod was a famous master : but less famous than Hildebert of Le Mans, whose stormy life of conflicting loyalties and ardent scholarship brought him in the end to the archbishopric of Tours. He is the only modern author whom John of Salisbury with his unerring judgment included among the classics (p. 99).

In the first quotation "He" is Fulbert ; in the second "He" is Hildebert. Both afford examples of a trick of style in the transition

to a new subject of which the author seems very fond, but which certainly does not make for lucidity.

But with all this, and even though the book as a serious contribution to the knowledge of its subject is disappointing, it is well worth reading for two things, for its wit and humour—I cannot resist quoting Miss Waddell's remark that "the limitation of the classical canon has left the average reader with the impression of a literature composed wholly in the eighteenth century"—and for the author's numerous and quite admirable translations of Latin lyrics. If here and there she seems to put a little more grace and poetry into the English versions than are easy to find in the Latin, well, the more familiar one is with a particular literature the more its phrases mean to one, and at any rate the fault, if fault it be, is one with which few translators indeed can be reproached.

R. B. McK.

The Later Court Hands in England from the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Century. Illustrated from the Common Paper of the Scriveners' Company of London, the English Writing Masters and the Public Records. By HILARY JENKINSON. Cambridge: University Press. 1927. Pp. x+200 and portfolio of 5 plates of alphabets and 44 plates of facsimiles. 45s.

MR. JENKINSON defines his object as

to provide the essential minimum of apparatus for a student desiring to master the writings used in English business documents (archives, in fact) of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and at the same time to settle the classification and sketch the history of the nine or ten distinct varieties of writing which existed side by side in England at the zenith of that period.

In the first half of this claim I think he is successful, though the seventeenth century is less fully represented. In the second I am less sure, but it is a great thing to have made a beginning in classification, a task at present practically unattempted. His book is more than handsomely brought out. It approaches the sumptuous, my only complaint being that I should have liked a thicker cover to protect the forty-four excellent plates. The transcripts and notes are quite satisfactory. Very great care has been spent on the twenty alphabets and on the very numerous illustrations in the text. The

"Common Paper" of the Scriveners is an important document, and the twenty-one plates taken from it illustrate professional hand-writings from 1392 to 1628 in a way which perhaps no other single document could equal, while the remaining twenty-three plates are carefully chosen to cover a wide field. Students of literary writings as well as archive-searchers will find abundant matter to interest them, both in the plates and in Mr. Jenkinson's dissertations. In regard to some of the chapters, however, they should not forget that the writer is speaking primarily of administrative documents only. The chapters on Symbols and Ciphers, Numerals, and Punctuation might otherwise lead them to think that certain forms came into general use later than is really the case. Many of them do not commonly occur in mediæval archives only because they were seldom needed. The bibliographies in these chapters are also rather incomplete. But these are matters rather outside the main purpose of the work. The strictly palæographical sections must be read with respect, even if not always with complete assent.

As to the classification of hands, detailed criticism would take much space, and would be out of place in this Review, but my chief objections to the nomenclature may be briefly summarised. In regard to what Mr. Jenkinson calls (I do not quite know why) the "zenith" of his period, the classification he adopts does not seem open to much criticism. We have some information as to the names used by writing masters, and such terms as Pipe Roll, Chancery, Legal are fairly definite. The difficulty comes when he tries to push this classification backwards and forwards. I agree with Mr. Jenkinson in connecting the technical term *Bastard* used by Baildon in his mid-Elizabethan copy-book (and doubtless the St. John's College accounts meant much the same thing by the term in 1524-1537) with the early fifteenth-century French usage of the term "*lettres bastardes*," but in tracing back the development of something that can fairly be termed English bastard I can only go a part of the way with him. I agree that William Brown's hand of 1492 (Plate IX) may be fairly called "pure bastard," but of the earlier fifteenth-century hands in the Common Paper most of those which to my eye bear a sufficient resemblance to French bastard to justify the name, are classified by Mr. Jenkinson as "fifteenth-century set hands"; in particular Plate VIII, No. ii, Plate VII, Nos. i and iv, Plate VI, Nos. i and iv, Plate IV, No. iii. The earliest of his specimens to which I find the term applicable is Plate II, No. ii. It should however be said

that in this classification I rely more on "style," by which I mean the general effect aimed at, than on the forms of individual letters. It is possible that in respect to these Mr. Jenkinson, who has evidently studied them closely, could show that his own system was more consistent. Eclecticism in forms however is apparent in all but the most conservative of official circles. Whether any satisfactory terminology is possible for the other parallel developments of style, in which most of Mr. Jenkinson's bastard hands are included, I am not prepared to say. I feel sure that any such table of descent of hands as that given on p. 79, even with the cautions which the author adds to it, is far too definite to be of much use. That very indefinite thing the "hand of the ordinary man" (not necessarily a "free hand") is constantly exerting its influence on the formal hands. Every man's hand has many ancestors in each generation, and to discriminate the effects of the various elements during three centuries is about as difficult as to estimate the effects of Angevin or Danish blood in the members of the Long Parliament. Nevertheless there are influences which are permanent and more or less constant. The book-hands before the invention of printing, and the type-forms, italic, Roman and Gothic afterwards, and the highly conservative legal hands are constantly pulling the ordinary man's hand back from its vagaries, and the writing master's books are not to be neglected. There is much to be done on the lines indicated by Mr. Jenkinson, and it is a great gain to have something to criticise.

J. P. GILSON.

The Physical Conditions of the Elizabethan Public Play-houses. By W. J. LAWRENCE. Harvard University Press. 1927. London: Oxford University Press. Pp. viii+129. 7s. 6d. net.

Pre-Restoration Stage Studies. By W. J. LAWRENCE. Harvard University Press. 1927. London: Oxford University Press. Pp. x+435. 23s. net.

HERE are two books packed tight with recondite learning. Granted some interest in their subject, is there a dull page in them? How, indeed, should they be dull, with Mr. Lawrence keener than the keenest detective of "mystery" fiction (the only delight, so I'm told, of the true intellectual) to track the actors and mechanics of the Elizabethan theatre that are his prey till they have yielded him

every secret of *their* mystery? Nor is any secret unimportant to Mr. Lawrence. Be it the position of a stage trap, "This is only one of the many problems which confront, fascinate and baffle every investigator . . ."; be it the question where the prompter stood, and Creizenach's suggestion that he stood behind the hangings, "But if Creizenach scored heavily here, he shot wide of the mark in taking the terms 'book-holder' and 'book-keeper' to be synonymous"; be it about the permanency of the inn-yard stages, "One has to summon up all one's moral courage before venturing to pontify on this vexed question of the removable stage." If he could but prove that they were mainly not removable! And, before the paragraph can end, "Such proofs are in my possession," cries Mr. Lawrence, for all the world like the detective in that last chapter of *The Murder in the Moated Grange*.

The layman in these matters—such a man as may know by heart the first-class cricket averages for the last twenty years—will doubtless find in all this much pothier about very little. But let those of us who care for the English poet-dramatists—particularly if our task is the appraising of their art—take off our hats in gratitude to Mr. Lawrence; make him an extra bow, too, across St. George's Channel, on behalf of British scholarship in general.

It is, he tells us, a " . . . rare type of scholar who is capable of appreciating Elizabethan drama as literature and of visualising it in action under the original conditions. . . ." Twenty years ago, when his own exemplary work was beginning, there were few scholars, he could have said, even conscious of the necessity. Yet the literary values themselves stand perverted otherwise. Much study of drama, moreover, that has no literary value must go to piece out our understanding of that which has, so fragmentary is the record, so obscure the tradition, so questionable—once we actually try to re-create the play imaginatively in action—do we still find our knowledge to be. The Elizabethan theatre has vanished away. While it lived, it so abounded in life, and in such a vigorous, uncalculating, versatile life, that regulation or record was the last thing it invited. Dead, it was for long found unworthy. If its best has survived as great literature, this too, at birth, had no more excuse for existence than the theatre's vitality gave it. Unless that life can be re-created imaginatively, the plays, even the greatest of them, will be but half alive. It may be the finer half that thus lives on for us. But, emasculate and sublime, this will be well on its way to the

oblivion of the text-books—which, for a work of art, is something worse than death. We must have, indeed, for the full salvation of Elizabethan dramatic literature a yet rarer type of scholar; one with the industrious patience to search out dull facts and reject attractive fallacies, to articulate dry bones, but such a scholar as through years of delving in that charnel house of the minor Elizabethan drama, can keep youthfulness of spirit, care for the simplest and respect for the most ridiculous things; these virtues together making a touchstone, and the only one, for the understanding of that game for grown-up children called the theatre. And such a scholar is Mr. Lawrence.

He is not, of course, above criticism. He would, I am sure, hate to think he was; for there—even in his impeccability—would be an end to the whole adventure. I am, I hope, competent enough to praise him intelligently; I am not competent to criticise him by the card. I write this review, moreover, removed from necessary references, so for positive criticism I must mainly substitute queries. I shall make them provocative when I can. For no one whose work is touched on by these problems, major or minor, but will want to extract the last ounce of certainty in their solution from him. And I can imagine no better way to set him testing all his evidence again than to provoke him, be it even to wrath and contempt, by casting doubt on the least of his now cherished conclusions. He is apt, one may say, to dismiss other people's conclusions somewhat brusquely. But he gibbets his own past mistakes with a positive gusto. He rejoices in the sport and expects every one else to; and knocks and trips are a part of it.

His discovery of the outside staircase upon the inn-yard stage is surely a discovery indeed. But will he please consider very carefully whether the said staircase could have been transferred as a permanent feature to such theatres as the Fortune and the Globe, yet more carefully if the Blackfriars could ever have accommodated it? For a staircase rising 12 foot must take up a fair amount of room. But will he not reconsider this alleged height of the upper above the lower stage in any case? Mr. Lawrence takes it that "... the front of the lowermost gallery in the public theatre was on stage level, and the front of the middle gallery on upper stage level. . . ." And we know from the famous specification that the heights of the two galleries in the auditorium were 12 and 11, and of the third 9 foot. Which gives us (does it?) the elevation of the tiring house,

the height of its inner and upper stages. That 12 foot from upper to lower stage level must somehow, I suggest, be reduced. It was admittedly a common leap for the actors to take; and 12 foot is an impracticable one. "Elizabethan actors," says Mr. Lawrence, "were nothing if not acrobats." He has better evidence of that, I hope, than the mere crediting them with such feats.

O me! my uncle's spirit is in these stones.
Heaven take my soul, and England keep my bones.

The boy-actor would have said it in grim earnest after such a drop on the hard boards.

Was the tiring-house in alignment with the public galleries? The main stage may well have been 3 foot above the ground level of the lowest gallery; or the 12 foot of that "first or lower storie," as the building contract has it, may have been measured practically from ground level. Anyhow 8 or 9 foot from upper to lower stage is drop enough for boy or man, and height enough for scaling ladders that can be carried quickly through doors, height enough too for the hoisting of the dying Antony and the like. And if this will leave the tiring-house elevation queerly proportioned, will Mr. Lawrence go a little further in reconsideration? Does he need an upper stage 11 foot high? What about 7 foot or 8 foot? And might not this provide for an additional garret, from which "machines" could be thrust forth and lowered, at a far more manageable height than that of his present supposition? Will he even consider, while he is on the subject, a horizontal ceiling, about 20 foot up from the stage (making two sides of a triangle with the upper part of the shadow); in which ceiling might be a trap, through which the machines could appear and disappear without their awkward thrusting out and recovery being seen. The working of such a trap would fit the passage in *Cymbeline* very nicely:

The marble pavement closes; he is entered
His radiant roof.

And upon such a "heavens" (though this is from the present point) there might have been stars painted, which some, at least, of the audience could have seen.

To finish with the tiring-house front. If that "pent house" stuck out, as Mr. Lawrence thinks it did, even the 10 inches of the builder's contract for the public galleries, it must have made the leaping down and the hauling up yet more troublesome. I don't

say there was no such pent house. But it would have been a nuisance, and the thickness where the traverses hung would answer fairly well. And as to the "bulk," for which Mr. Lawrence owns he searches in vain—no, I don't believe in the bulk. Any convenient corner, or recess, or pillar would serve. Let us continue to credit playwright, actors, and audience with thus much imaginative accommodation.

For here, I think, we may scent a danger in this intensive study of stage mechanism; its success carries with it a new tendency to discount unfairly the Elizabethan theatre's imaginative side. To catalogue these resources is one thing, to evaluate them another. And now and then, I fancy, Mr. Lawrence misreads his evidence by not looking carefully enough into the nature of the record. The workings of a play, for example, are apt to be written down in prompt-book or text, now in terms of cause, now of effect, and often at haphazard. A few Elizabethan prompt-books have survived, and they are naturally most valuable material. But before we begin to weave their marginal scribbles into the general fabric of our imagined theatre we shall do well to consider just what a prompt-book is and how it comes to be made.

It is not only nor primarily the means by which the conduct of a performance is regulated. Its making is begun at rehearsals, its first use is to give these continuity, and it may therefore contain much reminder to the actors of the meaning or treatment of scenes; and this may be written in terms of effect. Further, with the play's future revival to be thought of, it may contain notes of anything in interpretation as well as mechanism that the mere text when taken up again might not call to mind. Further yet, each prompter will make his book more or less according to his own liking; it will reflect, besides, the conditions of a particular theatre. At best, then, here is shaky foundation for argument and comparison. A study of the living creature, of the genus prompter to-day (or of yesterday; when, in a stock company, he was a very lively and important person indeed), may well tell us more of the habits of his ancestors than will a tedious reconstruction of their "remains."

For instance, Mr. Lawrence may on general principles be fairly sure that no prompter ever left his place to "call" actors for their cues, or did more than signal from it to the contrivers of the "noises without." The "platt" was perhaps the proper resource of the call-boy and property men, who would work independently of him

when they could, a reminder to the actors as well. If the sides of the inner-stage were more or less open, the prompter might signal cues to the actors gathered there, and might have to, for the simple reason that, standing back, it would be none too easy for them to hear a cue spoken far out on the platform. If he often marked down the minor parts, and these only, by the names of their actors, the reason was as simple. It was easy enough to remember who was playing Hamlet or Claudius or Polonius and to identify them in character. As to Voltimand or Cornelius, Rosencrantz or Guildenstern, and yet smaller fry, what they looked like dressed up, or who might be going on for the parts this time — ! Far simpler to have to whisper, "Enter Dick and Bill."

He never left his corner. And the joke about the

. . . without-book prologue faintly spoke
After the prompter. . . :

might be some evidence of it, if any were needed. Even to-day, in old-fashioned continental theatres, it is the custom for the prompter to read the whole play *sotto-voce* a line ahead of the actors. He sits, of course, beneath that hood immediately in front of them. Harder for the Elizabethans to hear their prompter ; and I should not be surprised if that little ground-floor window (of which Mr. Lawrence in another connection so ably proves the existence) turned out to be the prompter's window, through which he peeped and whispered. A little latticed and curtained window is, or used to be, cut in the prompt side "tormentor" in every theatre. Is this a direct descendant ? The near-by audience would always hear the words of the prompter "faintly spoke" ; one often hears them on the Continent to-day. As the voice of the nervous prologue failed to faintness the voice of the prompter would grow loud, amid the mocking applause of the audience, maybe. I have myself heard an Italian audience hush down a prompter.

But when it comes to considering whether stage directions in a prompt-book are certain evidence of what actually happened on the stage, I beg Mr. Lawrence, creditably cautious as he usually is, to redouble his caution. Often they are, and as a rule we should know from the terms they are couched in whether they are or no. But a purely imaginary effect may find its way in, detailed in practical phrase, written down upon a hint from the author, or composed by the prompter himself. He might write down what the actor had practically to do or merely to imagine indifferently in practical or

imaginative terms. "Noise," "Trumpet," obviously means that a noise was made and a trumpet sounded. "Three sunnes appear in the aire." Mr. Lawrence says this plainly shows that the three suns actually did. I implore him to be sceptical. If it were "Sunnes appear" or "Show sunnes" we might be driven to the belief that something of the sort was attempted. Even so we should be left asking: In heaven's name, what and how? But see where these will o' the wisps in guise of consistency lead Mr. Lawrence.

Approach, thou Beacon to this under-globe,
That by thy comfortable beams I may
Peruse this letter.

Are we really to suppose that here some lanthorn did "the horned moon present," or that anything but Kent's imagination and the audience's was called upon? I wonder that while he so firmly and rightly dismisses Macbeth's and Banquo's horses to the limbo of Dr. Simon Forman's carelessness or imagination, he should be tempted to linger himself in the dangerous rays of those mechanical moonbeams. They exist, I suggest to him, in his imagination only; and he does Shakespeare's and his audience's some wrong.

The terminology of the theatre has always been tiresomely inexact. And our own terminology in discussing the Elizabethan theatre to-day needs more careful definition. We speak of night being symbolised by torches in the day-lit public theatres. Next we speak of realism, Mr. Lawrence telling us that fogs and scented vapours were produced. Admit it; but as far as any concealment of the actors from each other or the audience was concerned they would be little less symbolic than the torches. There was rain. It may be so. But the eighteenth-century "storm of peas," which he refers to for comparison, did not, I think, fall on the actors—it would have been invisible and quite ineffective, except to distract them—but on drums or a metal sheet in the wings. There was thunder and lightning; but its realism then—as now, with all the realistic resources possible—was only a matter of degree. There was the "noise of a sea-fight." I suspect it differed mainly from the noise of a land-fight by the addition of "Ayasts" and "Belays." And as to the "noise of driving cattle without"; if this was how a dramatically-minded prompter wrote it down, his helpers in the doing were probably reduced to a "Gee up" and a whip-crack or so.

Mr. Lawrence is assiduity itself in research. He would seem to

have gone over the whole field of Elizabethan drama with a fine-tooth comb, and truly it is a remarkable harvest of fact that he gathers. He is shrewd and skilful at induction. But the theatre is inconsequence itself. It laughs at logic. From the conscientious investigator's point of view it often behaves like a very jade. Mr. Lawrence is hard upon guess work; and certainly he is right to be. "Contemptible guess work," he calls it; and he has won the best of his victories, no doubt, by sheer reasoning, patience and common sense.

Such knowledgeable shrewdness, for instance, as settles—once and for all surely—the problem of the pictures in the "closet" scene in *Hamlet* (the matter may, to our expert on cricket averages, seem very unimportant, but it has exercised the minds of hundreds of actors and producers) and detects the dramatic point of a single word in "Look *here* upon this picture and on that"; as settles also the "fundamentibility" of the theatre music-room and a dozen other such problems; properly bases *Oun*, and gives us the doctrine of the enclitic *De* dead as a doornail from the waist both up and down too—such shrewdness should surely never be betrayed. But the jade lies in wait. Guess work shall conquer her now and then, she seems to say, and too much logic be a snare. Consider Mr. Lawrence's own guess at the cause of the failure of *The Faithful Shepherdess*. He minimises its value very modestly, yet how true it rings! But a page or two later comes his chapter on traps. It is full of traps, and of more than one sort; and it is to be feared he himself falls into a few of them.

"Although for fully a score of years," he begins, "there has been a world-wide investigation of the physical conditions of the Elizabethan theatre, it is at once astonishing and humiliating how little we really know about the characteristics, the number and the working of early stage-traps. We have been vouchsafed no reasoned conclusion on the subject. . . ." But now, we may be sure, if mortal man can do it, this humiliation will be lifted. By the end of the chapter there can be little about traps left unsaid. Three-fourths of the conclusions, I don't doubt, are valid. But, for the rest, will he not (I beg him) give them reconsideration and ask whether he really need let logic and industry lead him so far and into such quandaries—such æsthetic quandaries? Does he really wish us to think that Juliet in her tomb was below stage and out of sight, that Romeo lowered the dead Paris on the top of her, and addressed his farewell speech—to a hole? And all because, by

one stage direction, "Juliet rises"! (And as far as Paris is concerned, what about "Pitiful sight, here lies the County slain"?)

Then there is the ghost in *Hamlet*. Doubtless, this did travel up and down a bit, and the final sinking at

Adieu, adieu, adieu, remember me,

has all the warrant of dramatic suggestion. But if Mr. Lawrence seriously supposes that at the climax of the earlier scene the wretched spectre "took a step forward and flung itself down the suddenly yawning grave trap"—well, I won't say: let him try it. I have a regard for his health. But let him hire the most athletic young man he can find to try something of the sort, and, all chance of broken bones and bruises apart, let him watch the feat and imagine the effect of it in the midst of that scene, done in broad daylight in the middle of a platform stage. He will remember that at Mr. Waldengarver's famous performance, the terrors of "the late king of the country" were received derisively. What the reception of the ghost at the Globe upon a reappearance after such a disappearance would have been, I will then ask him to imagine. And, if tradition can be trusted, here was Shakespeare playing the part in person. No, I do beg him to free us from a vision of the immortal William flinging himself down that trap—six foot at the shallowest. I am no stickler for dignity, but this is really more than I can bear.

HARLEY GRANVILLE-BARKER.

"The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore" (A Bibliotic Study).

By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM. New York: The Tenny Press, 33-35, West 17th Street. [1927.] Pp. 135. Price \$3.00.

THERE has been of late so much discussion of the play of *Sir Thomas More* that it can hardly be necessary, in order to explain the purpose of Dr. Tannenbaum's study, to do more than to remind readers that the play has come down to us in a single damaged MS. written by several hands and, apparently, in a state of unfinished revision. The bulk of the work is in a hand generally referred to as S and now identified as that of Anthony Munday; the other hands being known as A, B, C, D, and E (identified as Thomas Dekker's). In the hand D are written three pages containing what is known as the insurrection scene, and it is about these three pages that controversy

has chiefly raged, for it has been claimed that the hand is Shakespeare's. With this, which is the central point of the problem, Dr. Tannenbaum's book is not primarily concerned except in so far as he rejects the Shakespearian attribution; but it is probable that it could only be settled definitely in conjunction with those subsidiary problems which are here dealt with, namely, the identity of the other authors concerned and the date when the MS. was written. Dr. Tannenbaum attempts to show that A was Henry Chettle, B Thomas Heywood, and C Thomas Kyd, by far the most important of these identifications being the third, for, as he says, "his [Kyd's] identification is the key which opens the doors to almost all the problems connected with this much discussed drama (p. 89)." Briefly, his argument runs that C was one of the original authors and revised the play "taking cognizance of the Censor's objections" (p. 91). If C was Kyd it necessarily follows that the play must have been written before the latter part of 1594, when Kyd died, and further, considering the troubles which overtook Kyd in May 1593, it cannot be supposed that he would take part in it after that date. "The play must therefore have been written, fair-copied, disapproved [by the Censor], and revised before the eventful May 12 [1593]" (p. 95), and Kyd's arrest must have been the cause why the play was eventually abandoned (p. 101).

Now, if C was Kyd there is, I think, little to be said against Dr. Tannenbaum's argument; but if he was *not* Kyd the whole structure falls to the ground. Not only certain minor arguments fail, but we are no nearer settling the important question of the date. There ceases to be any special reason for placing it before May 1593, rather than, with Mr. Oliphant, in 1598-9 or, with Sir Edmund Chambers, *c.* 1600.

The whole matter turns therefore on the question whether Dr. Tannenbaum is able to prove that C was Kyd, and in this I, for one, cannot see that he has succeeded. The two hands are, no doubt, of the same general type, they both have a somewhat professional appearance, and the capitals of both keep fairly close to the models of the writing-masters, but beyond this there appears to be no special resemblance. There is no space here to discuss the matter in detail, a thing which it would indeed be quite useless to attempt without facsimiles, but seeing that the author bases his argument mainly on the forms of particular letters, I may refer to one marked characteristic which is apparent at the first glance in

Kyd's "English" hand, namely, the peculiar straight wedge-shaped and much sloped downstroke of the *d* found frequently both in the Letter to Puckering and the Articles of Accusation against Marlowe. In C the more normal rounded loop seems everywhere to be used.

Dr. Tannenbaum has given us two pages of careful tracings of the forms of individual letters, and seems to place much weight on these as evidence in support of his case, but save when quite abnormal forms occur, as they do in some hands, but not, so far as I can see, either in the hand of C or in Kyd's, I doubt whether single letters can be of much help in identification. The character and individuality of a hand depends surely on its general appearance, the way the writing is placed on the paper, the spacing, the slope of the letters, the relative weight of up and down strokes, the general "movement" of the whole. Most of us could without a moment's hesitation identify the writings of fifty or more friends and correspondents, but have we ever the slightest idea—unless some special reason has led us to observe it—how any one of them forms a single letter? And is it not a common experience that when we wish to decipher a name—say in an address—written by a careless correspondent and try to make out from the rest of his script how he forms certain letters, we nearly always find that he forms them in very varied ways, although the writing is clearly and unmistakably in the same hand throughout? But if we admit, as I think we must, that it is on general appearance rather than on detailed forms that we must base our judgment, we are faced by the difficulty that the general appearance of a script differs enormously according to the circumstances in which it was written. A careful letter executed with a good pen on fine paper will be altogether different from a rough note on a waste scrap. That we can often identify even a scrap of a friend's writing is due, I think, less to any particular points of similarity about which we can argue, or which we can explain to others, than to a sort of instinct arising from our daily experience of a vast number of contemporary hands, so that very minute shades of difference in general character are apparent to us in writings which to those with less experience would appear to be indistinguishable; just as while to the untravelling Englishman all Chinese look much alike, to one who has lived in China they are as individual as his own countrymen. In short, our criterion, in such a case as the *More* MS., must be, not individual letters, but general appearance, and unless we can find manuscripts of very much the same kind and not far apart in date, it is only after an

immense amount of experience of different hands—of the same order as our experience of contemporary hands—that we should expect to conclude with any certainty on the identity of the writers. All this is perhaps obvious, and I do not think that Dr. Tannenbaum would deny it, but I cannot feel that he has quite fully appreciated the difficulties of the task which he has attempted, or that there is any evidence that he has the very wide knowledge of Elizabethan hand-writings which alone can enable any one to say with certainty that two manuscripts written under different conditions are really by the same hand and not merely by persons who write somewhat like one another. It is difficult not to feel that, just as Fleay would seem to have thought it necessary to assign every scrap of Elizabethan drama to one or other of the dramatists whose work is known to us, in spite of the fact that many are known by name of whose work we are entirely ignorant, and that there may have been many more whose very names are unknown to us, so Dr. Tannenbaum seems to have made up his mind to distribute the hands of *Sir Thomas More* among the dramatists whose writing is known to him from Dr. Greg's *English Literary Autographs*. He has no doubt in every case fixed on the most similar hand to the one which he wished to identify, but after all the collection does not represent all or nearly all the persons who may have been concerned in *More*.

As I have said, if we cannot accept the author's identification of C with Kyd, most of his argument falls to the ground; but a word must be said as to his two other identifications. His claim that A is Henry Chettle will, I expect, be generally admitted. At any rate the suggestion is an excellent one, and the resemblance of the hands, not only in single letters but in whole words, and in general character, is very striking, as may be seen in the facsimiles here given, or better by a comparison of collotypes of Chettle's hand given in *Eng. Lit. Autographs* with the portion of Fol. 6a in Dr. Greg's edition of *More* (Malone Soc.). The identification of B with Thomas Heywood had already been suggested, with some doubt, by Dr. Greg. Here I feel that I, at any rate, cannot offer an opinion. It seems to me that while there is indeed some general resemblance in the hands there is even more difference, but there are special difficulties in this case owing to the absence of examples of Heywood's writing which fall within the period to which *More* must be attributed, and it is a matter for the very expert.

Dr. Tannenbaum's book is an interesting contribution to the

very difficult but fascinating problem of *More*, but save as regards the identification of hand A, I doubt if he has brought us very much nearer to its final solution.

R. B. MCKERROW.

Parnassus Biceps, or Several Choice Pieces of Poetry, 1656.

Edited by G. THORN DRURY, Sometime Scholar and now Honorary Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford. London: Frederick Etchells & Hugh Macdonald, 12, Kensington Place, W.8. MCMXXVII, 8vo. (370 numbered copies issued, of which 66 copies, numbered 1-66, have been printed on hand-made paper.) 15s. net.

MR. THORN DRURY has made another addition to his numerous services to English scholarship by editing *Parnassus Biceps*, an exceedingly interesting miscellany of verse collected in the middle of the seventeenth century by Abraham Wright, the father of James Wright, the author of the well-known *Historia Histrionica*. Abraham Wright was a cavalier and High Church parson, and a Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, who was deprived of his Fellowship by the Parliamentary Commissioners, "lived in a retired condition till after the decollation of King Charles I," and returned to his vicarage of Oakham after the Restoration, where he remained until his death in 1690.

Like many "cavalier ministers" Wright had "a genie which enclined him to poetry and rhetoric," and himself contributed English verses to two Oxford collections. The most interesting point in Mr. Thorn Drury's Prefatory Note concerns his Latin work, *Novissima Straffordi*, an account of Strafford's trial, which was first published by the Roxburghe Club under the editorship of Bliss and Bandinel in 1846. These editors prefixed a note to it in which they stated that they had seen "a volume of manuscript collections made by Wright in his youth," which contained "some early and original criticisms on Shakespeare." It is very regrettable that they were content merely to record their discovery. The volume which they mention seems to have disappeared, as an inquiry made in *Notes and Queries* (5th Series, vi, 28) failed to elicit any information.

Parnassus Biceps must be judged according to the aims of the compiler. It is not an attempt to assemble specimens of the best

verse of the period. As its title-page tells the reader, it contains "*Several Choice Pieces of Poetry, Composed by the best Wits that were in both the Universities before their Dissolution.*" It is, in fact, an anthology of verse by the Royalist members of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and more particularly those who were in Holy Orders. This point is stressed by Wright in his delightful "*Epistle in the behalfe of those now doubly secluded and sequestered Members*" addressed to "the Ingenuous Reader." "*Your Authors,*" he writes, "*of these few sheets are Priests, as well as Poets.*" They include four men who had been or were to be Bishops of the Church of England (King, Corbet, Earle and Morley), besides a number of Deans, Canons and inferior Clergy, but of the two dozen authors that Mr. Thorn Drury has identified "at least half were never in Holy Orders." The book represents exactly the kind of verse that was written by and appealed to the average well-educated Royalist of the first half of the seventeenth century, and herein lies what Mr. Thorn Drury truly calls its "unusual if not unique interest." It is here that the student of seventeenth-century literature may see more clearly than in the works of the great poets, who were capable of rising above literary fashions, the state of English poetry before Dryden, in the words of Dr. Johnson, "refined the language, improved the sentiments, and tuned the numbers." When the reader is confronted with the extravagant conceits and the exceedingly free use of the "overflowing" couplet that are, perhaps, the most noticeable features of the majority of the poems, he is not likely to deny that some such reform was needed. Some of the most surprising of the conceits are to be found in the lines by William Lewis, D.D., Provost of Oriel, "*Upon some pieces of work in York House.*" This is the passage in which Dr. Lewis describes the polished marble floor:

Feet touch our feet. This mystery beguiles
Philosophy of many thousand wiles.
Nay to encrease the miracle; with ease
We here become our own Antipodes.

For a combination of frigidity and bathos it would be hard to beat the following lines by John Earle, Bishop of Salisbury, *On the Earle of Pembroke's Death*:

Come *Pembroke* lives. O doe not fright our eares
With such destroying truth, first raise our fears
And say he is not well; that will suffice
To force a river from the publick eyes.

Or if he must be dead, Oh let the newes
 Speak't in a stonish'd whisper, let it use
 Some phrase without a voyce, 'twould too much cloud
 Our apprehension should it speak aloud.

But if *Parnassus Biceps* provides numerous examples of the vices of early seventeenth-century poetry, it is also representative of that gracious lyrical charm which was to fade so rapidly after the Restoration. It contains a version (unfortunately not a good one) of Wotton's great lines to Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, others of Donne's *On the praise of an ill-favoured Gentlewoman* (Elegie ii: a better version than that which is printed by Grierson) and *The Autumnall*, and among less-known masterpieces the lovely poem "*On a Gentlewoman walking in the Snow*," which, although it has often been printed as Anonymous, was, as Mr. Thorn Drury points out in his note, actually one of Strode's best known poems. But the flower of the collection is undoubtedly Cartwright's exquisite "*Song of Dalliance*," *Loves Courtship* (p. 136), included by Bullen in his *Speculum Amantis*. Although the subject is perhaps not exactly what one would expect to be treated by a priest of the Church of England and a junior proctor, there can be no doubt that it is one of most surprising metrical achievements of the century, recalling Campion's most melodious effects:

Hark my *Flora*, Love doth call us
 To the strife that must befall us
 He hath robbed his mothers Myrtles,
 And hath puld her downy Turtles.
 See our geniall posts are crownd,
 And our beds like billowes rise:
 Softer lists are no where found,
 And the strife its selfe's the prize.

After reading this poem one is not surprised to hear that Cartwright was accounted "the most florid and seraphical preacher in the University."

Many of the poems have a very great historical interest. The best side of the cavalier spirit is admirably expressed in "*A Poem In defence of the decent ornaments of Christ-Church*":

Glory did never yet make God the lesse,
 Neither can beauty defile holinesse.
 Whats more magnificent than Heaven? yet where
 Is there more love and piety than there.

The ballad *Upon the Kings Returne to the City* and *A Song of the Precise Cut* are admirable examples of the rough political satires of the period.

Not the least important part of the book is Wright's prefatory Epistle. It is a characteristic example of the florid highly decorated prose of the pre-Restoration period. The following sentence is typical of its sonorous rhythms :

For as the great Councell of Trent had a form and conclusion altogether contrary to the expectation and desires of them that procured it ; so our great Councils of England (our late Parliaments) will have such a result, and catastrophe, as shall no ways answer the Fasts and Prayers, the Humiliations, and Thanksgivings of their Plotters and Contrivers : such a result I say, that will strike a palsie through Mr. Pims ashes, make his cold marble sweat ; and put all those severall Partyes, and Actors, that have as yet appeared on our tragical bloody Stage, to an amazed stand and gaze : when they shall confess themselves (but too late), to be those improvident axes and hammers in the hands of a subtle Workman ; whereby he was enabled to beat down, and square out our Church and State into a Conformity with his own.

In spite of its beauty, the unwieldiness of this kind of prose makes it easy to realise how desirable the "close naked" style recommended by the Royal Society came to be in the next half-century.

It need hardly be said that Mr. Thorn Drury's notes are full of interest. He makes some valuable remarks on the authorship of several of the poems. The ribald little ballad called *A journey into France*, which has been ascribed sometimes to Suckling, but more often to Corbet, is conclusively proved to be the work of neither, but probably that of a Mr. Thomas Goodwin, while evidence is brought to show that the ascription of the two sets of verses *On Faireford windows* to Corbet is incorrect, although one of them is printed in all the seventeenth-century editions of his works.

Mr. Thorn Drury is following up his *Parnassus Biceps* with an edition of *Covent Garden Drollery*, an even more interesting miscellany. It is to be hoped that he will edit all the chief anthologies of the Protectorate and Restoration periods. The original editions are now only to be obtained by fortunate millionaires, and the few reprints edited by Ebsworth are nearly as rare, and are by no means satisfactory in the light of modern scholarship. Mr. Thorn Drury's qualifications for this task are unique. They are an unrivalled knowledge of the life and literature of the period, an exact scholarship combined with the most perfect taste and tact, and finally the possession of a library which, in this particular department, must be among the richest in the world.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

Papers written by Dr. Johnson and Dr. Dodd in 1777.

Printed from the Originals in the possession of A. EDWARD NEWTON, Esq.; with an Introduction and Notes by R. W. CHAPMAN. Illustrated with Facsimiles. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1926. Pp. xvi+36. 21s. net.

UNDER this title Mr. Chapman has collected, in a beautifully printed and bound little volume, a series of documents which is doubly interesting to students of the period. Time has gathered a kind of romantic halo about the smallest detail preserved by scholarship of the doings of Dr. Samuel Johnson, and to this is added the less reputable but not less alluring aura which still clings to the personality of that once popular preacher, the "macaroni parson," the last man to be hanged at Tyburn for forgery.

Fresh light is thrown by this collection upon the strange incident of Johnson's effort to save the life of Dodd, but the story remains something of a mystery. He had no more than the most casual acquaintance with Dodd, for he had met him, according to Boswell, only once; but he seems to have had no illusion as to the character of the man he befriended, or as to his usefulness to society. Less than a year after Dodd's death, in speaking of him Johnson said: "A man who has been canting all his life may cant to the last." And at a dinner party at Thrale Hall, "A Clergyman" (whose name failed to make any impression on Boswell's memory, and whose consequent anonymity has inspired one of Max Beerbohm's most characteristic essays), by his unfortunate question concerning Dodd's sermons, drew forth the thunderous comment: "They were nothing, Sir, be they addressed to what they may." Yet so strongly did the case of Dodd move his sympathies, that the uncompromising (and incalculable) Dr. Johnson, in order to save the neck of a worthless hypocrite, set out, with most careful precautions for secrecy, to deceive the public in a series of appeals for mercy which purported to be written by Dr. Dodd, and which, after failing in their original object, he prepared to publish for the financial benefit of Mrs. Dodd, only desisting from this when urged to do so by the widow herself.

Dodd was hanged on June 27, 1777. In the following April Johnson delivered the opinions upon him quoted above. It is, however, significant that three months after the execution, during September, 1777, when the story was still fresh in the public mind,

Boswell tells us that he praised the canting parson for what was perhaps a momentary sincerity :

Dr. Johnson told us at tea, that when some of Dr. Dodd's pious friends were trying to console him by saying that he was going to leave " a wretched world," he had honesty enough not to join in the cant : " No, no (said he), it has been a very agreeable world to me." Johnson added, " I respect Dodd for thus speaking the truth, for, to be sure, he had for several years enjoyed a life of great voluptuousness."

But it seems to have been the enormity of the punishment in proportion to the offence, rather than regard for the convict, that stirred Johnson to action. Writing to Dodd in prison the day before his death, he said :

Be comforted : your crime, morally or religiously considered, has no very deep dye of turpitude. It corrupted no man's principles ; it attacked no man's life. It involved only a temporary and reparable injury. . . .

Dodd's crime was, indeed, that of deceiving the public by means of a written document ; there is a double irony in the fact that it was precisely by a repetition of such deception that his would-be deliverer tried to save his life, and, failing, wrote to him in words with which he might quite fittingly have soothed his own scruples.

Perhaps the neatest point, however, in this ready-made " satire of circumstance " is realised only when one reads over Dodd's sermon (published fifteen years before his end), entitled, " The Frequency of Capital Punishments inconsistent with Justice, Sound Policy, and Religion," in which, after some eloquence and more good sense, he says : " May it not be fairly questioned, whether any legislator or magistrate, any state or society, can with *Justice* take away life for every offence, in many cases for *trivial* offences ? " Whether or no, Dodd himself was the last man to suffer death for the " *trivial* offence " of forgery.

The thirty-one papers printed by Mr. Chapman (for the first time, in many instances) were originally collected by Mr. Allen, Johnson's landlord and neighbour in Bolt Court, through whose hands all communications between himself and Dodd passed. Allen kept, when he could, the original papers, and in most other cases when these could not be retained he kept copies of them. Mr. Chapman's introduction and notes show that this collection, as such, was almost certainly unknown to Boswell. Besides this, they elucidate the relation that it bears to the projected publication which

was stopped at Mrs. Dodd's request, and which, eight years later, Kearsly reprinted in an appendix to the 1785 anonymous *Life of Samuel Johnson as Occasional Papers by the late William Dodd, LL.D.* In the latter connection Allen's collection is particularly interesting, as it shows Johnson's original draft of various papers which were probably altered by Dodd before he used them, since they appear in slightly different form in Kearsly's reprint. Facsimiles of nine of Johnson's autographs are given, together with one of Allen's (?) copy of Dodd's letter of thanks, written to Johnson two days before death, and printed by Boswell.

All serious devotees of Johnson must, of course, owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Chapman for this further example of his usual scholarly work; but those who, like the writer, can claim only a frivolous interest in Dr. William Dodd, will be equally grateful for the lucidity of his remarks. Involved as is the story that lies behind the publication of these papers, its complications have not resulted in making the editor's exposition of it dull. For this boon—unfortunately too rare—he has earned an extra vote of thanks.

L. FIELD.

The Elements of Book Collecting. By IOLO A. WILLIAMS.
Elkin Mathews & Marrot, Ltd. 1927. 7½"×6". Pp. 171.
8s. 6d.

THIS is the only good book on its subject that I have ever read. My recollection of two or three ancient predecessors is that they were written by men who, if they were collectors at all, were miscellaneous collectors with no higher ideal than that of picking up, at something below its market value, any book in which bibliographical interest could be taken. The information which they gave, even when correct, was superficial and desultory, and they certainly did not present book-collecting as a reasonable or attractive occupation. The handbook which Mr. Iolo Williams has written towers over these ancient predecessors because he himself is a true collector, concerned with a limited field, the imaginative English literature of (roughly) the early eighteenth century, and from the intimate knowledge which he has been driven to obtain for himself much of his book will be useful to collectors interested in other periods and even in other aspects of collecting. Among the "few suggestions" which

Mr. Williams offers in his penultimate chapter is one for the collecting of all the printed literature issued in a particular town or district, but it is in imaginative literature that he himself is interested, and readers of this *Review* will not be quick to blame him. At the moderate price at which it is issued, his book will not be a bad purchase for those who are mainly interested in the material form of books, or even for collectors of books on particular subjects, but it is not written with any special concern for their needs. Mr. Williams was driven to specialise on books of the eighteenth century (it must be noted, however, that he possesses Cowley folios) because earlier ones were too expensive. Now the eighteenth-century books are becoming expensive also, and he can only recommend his followers to turn to the works of the contemporaries of Scott and Byron and Keats. The books of our own day, in which just now there is so much petty gambling, he thinks a dull and risky investment—dull because one copy is so like every other, risky because he believes that there are too many copies potentially in the market for the collector who has to consider his heirs to feel sure that they will be able to get back the money he is spending. What is to happen to those who are born with book-collecting in their blood when the minor literature of the nineteenth century is exhausted, he does not tell us. There was certainly a good deal of it. The technical part of Mr. Williams' handbook is comprised in some eighty pages, divided into five chapters dealing successively with the sizes of books, the parts of a book, books perfect and imperfect, issues and editions, and how to describe a book. All of them are good, and the budding collector who will examine his early purchases in the light of them and practise himself in collation and accurate description will not be likely to make what Mr. Williams calls "one of the most astounding, one of the saddest confessions I ever read":

that of the late William Harris Arnold, a well-known American collector, who, at the end of a long career of book-collecting, wrote that he had only once made a bibliographical discovery—and that a very small one.

To Mr. Williams the justification of book-collecting as an occupation is that it tends to "the increase of the general sum of knowledge upon some particular subject," and he defies "any intelligent person to look at all carefully over even a small collection without making bibliographical discoveries." This may seem to put the case for detective bibliography a little high, but I think it is sound.

A. W. POLLARD.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

ANGLIA, Vol. LI. (Neue Folge XXXIX.), December 1927—

Unechte Ælfric-texte (Karl Jost), pp. 177-219.

Die Sprichwörter Hendings und die Prouerbis of Wysdom
(G. Schleich), pp. 220-77.

Das Malerische in Rossettis Dichtung (Eva Tietz), pp. 278-306.

Shakespeares Orthographie (Wilhelm Marschall), pp. 307-22.

Zu Chaucers Traumgedichten und deren Auffassung durch A. Bruns-
dorff (V. Langhans), pp. 323-53.

Methodisches zur Ermittlung der Schreiberindividualität in mittel-
englischen Handschriften (Leo v. Hübner), pp. 354-71.

Byrons Vorfahren und Kindheit (Schluss) (Hermann Conrad),
pp. 372-83.

BODLEIAN QUARTERLY RECORD, Vol. V., November 1927—

Lending Books in a Mediaeval Nunnery, pp. 188-90.

From *Ordinale* for the use of the Nuns of Barking Abbey.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Vol. 12, January 1928—

William Blake (C. H. Herford), pp. 31-46.

John Bunyan, 1628, November, 1928 (The Editor), pp. 122-33.

One more Lauderdale Letter (Louise F. Browne), pp. 134-36.

To Baxter, March 1660.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, October 1927—

The Tennysons at Farringford: A Victorian Vista (M. A. De Wolfe
Howe), pp. 447-57.

Unpublished letters of Mrs. James T. Fields.

Austin Dobson: Some Letters from His Friends—III. (Alban
Dobson), pp. 496-510.

—November—

A Habitation's Memories: I. Johnsoniana; II. Literary Associations
(Lady Charnwood), pp. 535-47.

Stowe House, Lichfield. Concluded December, pp. 664-77.

The Three Musketeers : A Defence of the Novel of Action (Orlo Williams), pp. 610-22.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, December—

Shakespeare and Politics (J. A. R. Marriott), pp. 678-90.

Some Thackeray Originals (P. R. Krishnaswami), pp. 705-20.

Continued January, pp. 83-88.

—January 1928—

The Political Novel (H. A. L. Fisher), pp. 25-38.

"When We Two Parted" : A Byron Mystery Re-solved (John Gore), pp. 39-53.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. 62, November 1927—

(This number is dedicated to Arnold Schröer on his seventieth birthday.)

Arnold Schröer (Johannes Hoops), pp. 3-16.

Emphatische Betonung als Quelle neuer Wortformen? (K. Luick), pp. 17-24.

Ellipse und Bedeutungswandel (W. Franz), pp. 25-34.

Von den semasiologischen Einheiten und ihren Untergruppen (Otto Funke), pp. 35-63.

Five Years of English Place-Name Study (1922-1927). A Critical Survey (R. E. Zachrisson), pp. 64-105.

Beiträge zur altenglischen Wort- und Namenkunde (Otto Ritter), pp. 106-12.

Die altenglischen Texte in der Pariser Nationalbibliothek (Max Förster), pp. 113-31.

Das Wakefelder Spiel von Kain und Abel (F. Holthausen), pp. 132-51.

Die metrische Unterscheidung von Ernst und Komik in den englischen Moralitäten (Eduard Eckhardt), pp. 152-69.

Einige grundsätzliche Bemerkungen zu Shakespeares *Sturm* (L. Kellner), pp. 170-86.

Die Familie bei Shakespeare (L. L. Schücking), pp. 187-226.

Heteronomie der literarischen Urteilsbildung (H. Schöffler), pp. 227-42.

Swinburne und Theodor Opitz. Zwei unveröffentlichte Swinburne-Briefe (Bernhard Fehr), pp. 243-49.

Aus der Frühzeit der amerikanischen Anglistik : Louis F. Klipstein (1813-79) (Walther Fischer), pp. 250-64.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN UND LITERATUREN, Vol. 52, October 1927—

Zur Textgestaltung der mittelenglischen Bearbeitung von Susos *Orologium Sapientie* (Schluss) (G. Schleich), pp. 178-92.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 251

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXVI., October 1927—

- Romanticism and Other Isms (F. E. Pierce), pp. 451-66.
- A Single Principle for English and Primitive Germanic Sound-Changes (C. M. Lotspeich), pp. 467-70.
- The Metrical Technique of Pope's Illustrative Couplets (C. M. Lotspeich), pp. 471-74.
- Unpublished Letters of Emerson (S. T. Williams), pp. 475-84.
- Browning's *Cleon* (A. W. Crawford), pp. 485-90.
- Studies in the Sources of Gower (G. L. Hamilton), pp. 491-520.
- The Latin and French Versions of *Barlaam and Josaphat*, and of the Legendary History of Alexander the Great.
- Erasmus Roterodamus in his Relation to Luther and Melanchthon (Ernest Voss), pp. 564-68.
- Early American Travelers in England (G. H. Orians), pp. 569-81.

LIBRARY, Vol. VIII., December 1927—

- Books and Readers, 1591-4 (G. B. Harrison), pp. 273-302.
- The Library Regulations of a Medieval College (H. W. Garrod), pp. 312-35.
- Merton College, Oxford.
- Bibliographical Notes on Some Marston Quartos and Early Collected Editions (Robert E. Brettell), pp. 336-48.
- The Malcontent*, 1604; *The Fawn*, 1606; *The Insatiate Countess*, 1613, 1616, 1631; Collected editions, 1633 and 1652.
- The Earliest Tables of the Highways of England and Wales, 1541-61 (Herbert G. Fordham), pp. 349-54.

LONDON MERCURY, Vol. XVII., January 1928—

- Johnson's Contributions to Other People's Works (J. C. Squire), pp. 273-85.
- Bibliographies of Modern Authors (Gwendolen Murphy), pp. 301-04.
- W. H. Davies.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLII., November 1927—

- Coleridge on Giordano Bruno (Alice D. Snyder), pp. 427-36.
- References in unpublished work.
- Coleridge's Theory of Dramatic Illusion (Dorothy I. Morrill), pp. 436-44.
- "Nature" as Aesthetic Norm (A. O. Lovejoy), pp. 444-50.
- The Song in *The Merchant of Venice* (Austin K. Gray), pp. 458-59.
- Wordsworth's *Vast City* (G. M. Harper), pp. 464-65.
- Note on *Prelude*, I. 6.
- Fynes Moryson and the Tomb of Till Eulenspiegel (J. A. Walz), pp. 465-66.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, December—

The Study of Shakespeare's Characters in the Eighteenth Century
(T. M. Raysor), pp. 495-500.

The Primitivism of Joseph Warton (A. L. Smith), pp. 501-04.

The Date of Hazlitt's First Visit to Coleridge (G. W. Whiting),
pp. 504-06.

"Mother of Dead Dogs" (F. W. Hilles), pp. 506-08.

Origin of Carlyle's phrase.

Sir John Denham and *Paradise Lost* (T. W. Baldwin), pp. 508-09.

Elizabethan Players as Tradesfolk (T. W. Baldwin), pp. 509-10.

The Male-Friendship Cult in Thomas Heywood's Plays (L. B. Wright),
pp. 510-14.

Una and her Lamb (Edwin Greenlaw), pp. 515-16

Marginalia on Longfellow, Lowell, and Poe (Killis Campbell),
pp. 516-21.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXIII., January 1928—

The Revisions of *Piers Plowman* (Mabel Day), pp. 1-27.

Bishop Gunthorpe (Marie Schütt), pp. 43-44.

The Source of *Othello*, Act III, Sc. iii, ll. 157-161 (A. H. Krappe),
pp. 44-45.

Chapman, *The Tragedy of Chabot*, Act III, Sc. ii, ll. 147-68 (A. S.
Ferguson), p. 46.

Sir Aston Cokayne and the "Commedia dell' Arte" (Kathleen M.
Lea), pp. 47-51.

Sir Walter Scott and the "Comédie Humaine" (R. K. Gordon),
pp. 51-55.

An English Note on Klopstock and Kant (H. G. Ward), pp. 60-63.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXV., November 1927—

The Chaucer of Spenser and Milton (F. P. Magoun, Jr.), pp. 129-36.
Identification of editions used.

An Unnoted Analogue to the *Pardoner's Tale* (Whitney Wells),
pp. 163-64.

In Topsell's *History of Serpents*.

The Genesis and General Meaning of Blake's *Milton* (F. E. Pierce),
pp. 165-78.

The Condition of the London Theaters, 1679-83: A Reflection of the
Political Situation (G. W. Whiting), pp. 195-206.

Two Wordsworthian Chapbooks (Helen S. Hughes), pp. 207-10.
Versions of *We are Seven*.

On Recent Work in General Linguistics (L. Bloomfield), pp. 211-30.
Documents and Records (Edith Rickert), pp. 249-55.

A Leaf from a Fourteenth-Century Letter-book.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 253

MONTHLY CRITERION, Vol. VI., December 1927—

Rudyard Kipling (Bonamy Dobrée), pp. 499-515.

—January 1928—

Burns and his Race (J. M. Robertson), pp. 33-46.

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER, Vol. CII., December 1927—

The Equestrian Drama (M. Willson Disher).

Adaptations of Shakespeare and Byron for Circuses. Concluded January, pp. 124-32.

—Vol. CIII., January 1928—

John Webster : Playwright and Naturalist (E. W. Hendy), pp. 111-23.

The Haworth Parsonage ; The Home of the Brontës (E. A. Chadwick), pp. 133-44.

—February—

George Meredith : A Reminiscence (Thomas Hardy), pp. 145-48.

Unpublished Letters of George Meredith (R. E. Gordon George), pp. 149-62.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 153, November 5, 1927—

A Neglected Factor in Place-Names (Alfred Watkins), pp. 327-30.

Hill Names ; Trading Names. Note by Student, November 12, p. 354 ; reply by A. Watkins, December 3, pp. 499-10.

—November 19—

The " Parnassus " Plays (S. R. Golding), pp. 363-66.

Question of authorship. Note by G. C. Moore Smith, December 10, p. 427.

St. Ronan's Well (W. Sabine), pp. 376-77.

Identification with Harrogate.

—November 26—

Spenser's Mistress, Rosalind (W. H. Welply and A. F. Partridge),

pp. 389-90.

Evidence of identity. Further notes, January 14, p. 29, and January 28, p. 69.

—December 10—

Sir George Etherege : Collections (Dorothy Foster), pp. 417-19.

Continued December 17, pp. 435-40 ; December 24, pp. 454-59 ; December 31, pp. 472-78 ; January 14, p. 28.

—Vol. 154, January 7—

The Bloody Brother (William Wells), pp. 6-9.

Authorship and date.

—January 14—

Unpublished Letters of Warren Hastings (H. B.), pp. 21-25.

Continued, January 21, pp. 39-40 ; January 28, pp. 57-59. Note by Evan Cotton, January 28, p. 68.

Seventeenth Century Proverbs from Edward Brooke's MS. (Bertram Lloyd), p. 27.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. VI., October 1927—

Renaissance Influences in Hall's *Mundus Alter et Idem* (Sandford M. Salyer), pp. 321-34.

Dryden as a Statist (Merritt Y. Hughes), pp. 335-50.

Astronomical Allusions in Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound* (Carl H. Grabo), pp. 362-78.

The Date of *Ralph Roister Doister* (T. W. Baldwin and M. Channing Linthicum), pp. 379-95.

Milton's Early Poems, the School of Donne, and the Elizabethan Sonneteers (George R. Potter), 396-400.

"So-Long," "Cold Feet," "To Bore from Within" (H. Z. Kip), pp. 400-05.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. XLII., December 1927—

More Notes on *Pearl* (O. F. Emerson), pp. 807-31.

The Source of Chaucer's *Rime of Sir Thopas* (Francis P. Magoun, Jr.), pp. 833-44.

The Ile d'Or Episode in *Libeaus Desconus*.

Rhetorical Balance in Chaucer's Poetry (Mary A. Hill), pp. 845-61.

A Middle English MS. in the Bibliothèque Ste. Geneviève, Paris (William P. Cumming), pp. 862-64.

Containing Rolle's *Form of Perfect Living* and *Ego Dormio* and other tracts.

Milton and Marston (S. Foster Damon), pp. 873-74.

L'Allegro and *Scourge of Villanie*.

Before *Areopagitica* (William Haller), pp. 875-900.

Milton and the Epic Subject from British History (Putnam Fennell Jones), pp. 901-9.

Two Athenian Models for *Samson Agonistes* (Wilmon Brewer), pp. 910-20.

Prometheus Bound and *Œdipus at Colonus*.

Optimism and Romanticism (Arthur O. Lovejoy), pp. 921-45.

Character and significance of eighteenth-century optimism.

A New Biographical Source for William Cowper (Robert E. Spiller), pp. 946-62.

Memorandum book of the Rev. John Johnson, 1795-1800.

Keats and Mary Tighe (Earle Vonard Weller), pp. 963-85.

Extent of Mrs. Tighe's influence.

More concerning Chapman's Homer and Keats (Grace W. Landrum), pp. 986-1009.

Wordsworth and Keats—A Study in Personal and Critical Impression (Clarence D. Thorpe), pp. 1010-26.

Carlyle as a Critic of Grillparzer (John C. Blankenagel), pp. 1027-35.

"Corones two" (Robert A. Cornelius), pp. 1055-57.

Note on *The Second Nun's Tale*.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 255

Comment on Criticism in the *Cinquecento* (Walter L. Bullock), pp. 1057-60.

Reply to *Renaissance Criticism and the Diction of the Faerie Queene*, P.M.L.A., XLI., 575-619.

Interpreting a Spenser-Harvey Letter (James H. Hewlett), pp. 1060-65.
An Irish Version of *Guillaume de Palerne* (Vernam Hull), p. 1066.

REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAINNE, Vol. V., December 1927—

Le Tristan d'Edwin Arlington Robinson (C. Cestre), pp. 97-110.

Chesterfield et les Français (P. Yvon), pp. 146-157.

Les premières éditions de *Gulliver* (E. Pons), pp. 158-60.

Note sur Chaucer (*Canterbury Tales*, B. 1687, *an heap*) (J. Derocquigny), pp. 160-61.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXV., January 1928—

Unpublished References to Blake by Hayley and Lady Hesketh (Hoxie N. Fairchild), pp. 1-10.

Blake and Klopstock (Frederick E. Pierce), pp. 11-26.

The 1762 Efflorescence of Poetics (Eric Partridge), pp. 27-35.

Thomas Warton and the Eighteenth-Century Dilemma (Raymond D. Havens), pp. 36-50.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, November 3, 1927—

The Date of Christopher Smart's Confinement (C. D. Abbott), p. 790.

Hardouin and Edwin Johnson (Arthur S. Peake), p. 790.

Boswell's Executors (Frederick A. Pottle), p. 790.

Allusions in *Esmond* (Clotilda Marson), p. 790.

Piggesnye (Agnes Arber).

Identification of plant.

—November 10—

The Prioress of Stratford (J. M. Manly), p. 817.

Part original of Chaucer's Prioress?

"Aitch-bone" (John M. Turnbull), p. 817.

—November 17—

The Edgeworths (H. E. Butler), p. 839.

Additional notes to the *Black Book of Edgeworthstown*.

—November 24—

Shakespeare's Hand Once More (W. W. Greg), p. 871.

Concluded, December 1, p. 908. Reply by S. A. Tannenbaum, January 12, p. 28.

"Peché-Mortel" (Paget Toynbee), p. 888.

Use as name for couch. Further notes by G. Stuart Robertson, December 1, p. 910; A. V. d. P., December 8, p. 934; Paget Toynbee, January 19, p. 44.

The Date of *The Mad Lover* (W. J. Lawrence), p. 888.

Fielding's Invocation to Fame (Hibernicus), p. 888.

Macaulay's New Zealander (J. A. Chapman), p. 888.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, December 1—

Fenimore Cooper and France (R. S. Garnett), p. 910.

Note by Cyril Falls, December 8, p. 934.

December 8—

Berners and Froissart (R. W. Chambers), p. 934.

"Reprints" and "new editions." Reply by B. H. Newdigate, December 15, p. 961; further notes by R. W. Chambers and T. W. Williams, January 5, p. 12.

December 15—

Blake and Bedlam (Mona Wilson), p. 961.

Origin of article in *Revue Britannique*, 1833.

Milton's Euripides (W. W. Vaughan), p. 961.

A Stang (F. J. Harvey Darton), p. 961.

Meaning of word. Note by A. Locke, December 22, p. 977.

Dr. Johnson and Peter Bodvel (R. Stewart-Brown), p. 961.

December 29—

Poems by Waller (H. J. C. Grierson), p. 989.

A pre-Restoration MS. Note by Georgina F. Malden, January 19, p. 44.

Mary Shelley's *Proserpine* and *Midas* (A. Koszul), p. 989.

January 5, 1928—

"Artificial" Comedy (G. M. Trevelyan), p. 12.

Parallel in real life. Note by Basil Williams, January 12, p. 28.

January 12—

Harington's Epigrams (W. W. Greg), p. 28.

"The Juggling Captain" in *The Fair Maid of the Inn* (Bertram Lloyd), p. 28.

"Keilets" (Richard Aldington), p. 28.

Replies by G. Rutherford and Emily Jeffrey, January 19, p. 44; by J. F. Milne, G. Fairholme and M. Montgomery, January 26, p. 62.

January 19—

Jeremy Collier's "Marcus Aurelius" (L. J. H. Bradley), p. 44.

Bibliographical note. Further note by Michael Holland, January 26, p. 62.

January 26—

Defoe's Release from Newgate (A. W. Secord), p. 62.

Per Maria (George Gordon), p. 62.

Note on Lamb's letter to Coleridge, October 9, 1802.

14

A

U